

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume V

WINTER 1953

Number 1

Dante and Sordello. By C. M. Bowra	1
Notes on the Development of the Scanderbeg Theme. By B. B. Ashcom	16
Herman Melville in Soviet Criticism. By John C. Fiske	30
Diderot's Own <i>Miss Sara Sampson</i> . By Robert R. Heitner	40
The Chicago Critics. By W. K. Wimsatt, Jr.	50
Benedetto Croce: Literary Critic and Historian. By René Wellek	75
Book Reviews	83
<i>I manifesti romantici del 1816 e gli scritti principali del "Conciliatore" sul romanticismo</i> , ed. by Carlo Calcaterra (Ernest H. Wilkins). <i>Una Antologia de la lirica nord-americana</i> , by Agustí Bartra (Josephine de Boer). <i>Nihon bungai to sekai bungai</i> , by Okazaki Yoshie (Howard Hibbett). <i>Diderot's Relations with Grimm</i> , by Joseph R. Smiley (Leland J. Thielemann). <i>Breve historia del hispanismo inglés</i> , by Antonio Pastor; <i>British Contributions to Spanish and Spanish-American Studies</i> , by J. C. J. Metford (Bernardo Gicovate). <i>China und die Chinesen in der neueren englischen und amerikanischen Literatur</i> , by Peter Venne (Arnold H. Rowbotham). <i>Life of Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558)</i> , by Vernon Hall, Jr. (W. P. F.). <i>A Critical Bibliography of French Literature</i> , Vol. IV, <i>The Eighteenth Century</i> , ed. by George R. Havens and Donald F. Bond (W. P. F.).	
Books Received	95

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature
Section of the Modern Language Association
of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1948, at the postoffice at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

FRANCIS FERGUSSON
Indiana University
Bloomington, Ind.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on comparative topics and on problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to:
Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is \$3.50 a year. The price of single copies is \$1.00. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
<https://abbassa.wordpress.com>

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME V

WINTER 1953

NUMBER 1

DANTE AND SORDELLO

C. M. BOWRA

ON THE lowest slope of the Mount of Purgatory Dante and Virgil, seeing that night is coming on, decide to make enquiries about the best way of ascent. They mark a solitary figure looking towards them and approach:

Venimmo a lei: O anima Lombarda,
Come ti stavi altera e disdegnosa,
E nel mover degli occhi onesta e tarda!

Ella non ci diceva alcuna cosa;
Ma lasciavane gir, solo sguardando
A guisa di leon quando si posa.

(*Purg.* VI, 61-66)

When questioned by Virgil about the way upward, this figure replies by asking about the strangers' country and life. On hearing the word "Mantua" he leaps up and embraces Virgil, and reveals that he is Sordello of the same city. At this dramatic point Dante suddenly breaks his narrative to devote seventy-six lines to a blistering denunciation of Italian discords and lawlessness. Then he picks up the tale and makes Sordello and Virgil exchange information about their respective places in the afterworld. Sordello then guides the two poets to the Valley of the Negligent Rulers, where he points out with appropriate comments the chief inmates and adds some hard words about their sons. When

during the night Dante and Virgil are transported to Purgatory proper, Sordello remains behind:

Sordel rimase, e l'altre gentil forme.

(*Purg.* IX, 58)

He has played his part and is not mentioned again.

Sordello is an important and engaging figure of his time, at once poet and man of affairs. Born towards the beginning of the thirteenth century at Goito, near Mantua, he entered the court of Count Ricciardo di San Bonifazio, lord of Verona, where he fell in love with his master's wife, Cunizza da Romano, and about 1223 eloped with her to the court of her brother, the terrible Ezzelino, at Treviso. Soon afterwards he abandoned Cunizza and made a secret marriage with Otta di Strasso. This meant that he had to flee from Treviso and the fury of his wife's relatives, and no doubt explains why about 1229 he left Italy for the south of France, where in due course he visited the courts of Provence, Toulouse, Roussillon, and Castile. About 1245 we find him at the court of the Countess Beatrice, daughter of Raymond Berengar, count of Provence, and wife of Charles of Anjou. From 1252 to 1265 Sordello's name appears in several treaties and records, which show that Charles held him in high esteem and entrusted him with important tasks. He followed Charles on his Italian expedition against Manfred in 1265, but seems to have been captured by the Ghibellines before reaching Naples. At any rate, in September 1266 he was a prisoner at Novara; but Clement IV persuaded Charles to ransom him, and in 1269 he received as a recompense for his services five castles in the Abruzzi near the Pescara River. Nothing more is recorded of him; but, since in the same year the castles passed to other owners, the probability is that he died at this time, being by now an elderly man.

Sordello was also a poet of distinction and renown. Of his poetry there survive twelve *chansons*, four *partimens*, two *tensons*, eight *sirventes*, fifteen *coblas*, and a long didactic poem in 1,327 lines called "L'Ensegnamen d'Onor."¹ His shorter poems may lack the virile gaiety of Guillaume of Aquitaine or the accomplished grace of Bernart de Ventadour or the passion of Bertran de Born, but they have their own distinction. He is an accomplished metrist, who knows how to lace rhymes into elaborate patterns; a stylist, who avoids phrases which are too trite or too recondite; a man of the world, who relates his poetry to his own varied experience. We can understand that Dante might think well of him, since, unlike Arnaut Daniel, who combines protestations of ideal love with desires which are more earthly, he is a thorough Platonist. Whatever his actual conduct may have been, his poetry is consistently

¹ The poems are edited by C. de Lollis, *Vita e poesie di Sordello di Goito* (Halle 1896). The documents concerning his life are also published in this volume.

high-minded and idealistic. He tells his lady that he does not wish to taste of any fruit whose sweetness will turn to bitterness (xxi, 23-24), that no knight loves his lady unless he loves his own honor equally (xxv, 17-19), that he will never reveal to any honest woman his true feelings about her (xxiv, 49-50), that every loyal lover is sufficiently recompensed if he is honored in himself (xxvii, 1 ff.).² He builds his cult of ideal love on personal honor and is quite consistent in his conclusions. It is not surprising that, in the interchange of verse between him and Peire Guillem, Peire says that he has never known anyone like Sordello, since he disdains what other men make it their ambition to win (xviii, 13 ff.). In Sordello's system the man of honor must love a woman as honorable as himself and be as sensitive for her reputation as for his own. If Sordello is not in the highest rank of troubadours, he is certainly the most distinguished of those who came from Italy and sufficiently original and powerful to have attracted Dante's attention by his poetry.

It has been claimed that Dante regards Sordello as himself a member of the class of negligent rulers and that this determines his place in Purgatory. So R. W. Church says: "He is placed among those who had great opportunities and great thoughts—the men of great chances and great failures."³ Something of the same kind seems to have been in Browning's mind when he wrote his remarkable poem about Sordello. For Browning he is an interesting failure, who might have been a true forerunner of Dante but through some defect of character or conviction failed to realize his proper destiny. It is true that Browning does not follow history very closely and that his Sordello is largely an imaginary figure; however, he too regards him as one who had great gifts and chances but failed to take advantage of them:

one who was chiefly glad
To have achieved the few real deeds he had,
Because that way assured they were not worth
Doing, so spared from doing them henceforth—
A tree that covets fruitage and yet tastes
Never itself, itself.

Church and Browning can hardly be right about Dante's treatment of Sordello. The only possible evidence that he is one of the negligent rulers is that Dante and Virgil leave him with them when they ascend to Purgatory proper, and that is by no means conclusive. On the other hand, there are good arguments against this view. First, if Sordello were himself one of this company, his language about its other members would be unsuitable, especially in Purgatory, for one who has himself been guilty of the same fault. Secondly, he was never himself in so ex-

² See A. Jeanroy, *La Poésie lyrique des troubadours* (Paris, 1943), II, 167.

³ *Dante and other Essays*, p. 228.

alted a position as the kings and princes whom he criticizes. He belonged to a section of society eminent enough in its own way but not charged with imperial or regal responsibilities, and Dante would hardly have classed him with the Emperor or the kings of France and England.

In fact, it is quite clear where Dante places Sordello, and his reasons for doing so are of some interest. When Dante and Virgil meet him, he is outside Purgatory proper and says of his position:

"Loco certo non c'è posto:
Licito m'è andar suso ed intorno;
Per quanto ir posso, a guida mi t'accosto."

(*Purg.* VII, 40-42)

Sordello's place indicates that he is one of the late repentant who have died violent deaths. Apparently Dante knew something about him which is not mentioned by the brief Provençal biographies. Nor is this surprising, since the biographies are very feeble affairs and draw most of their information from the poems. There is no difficulty about Dante knowing of an event which took place in 1269 and must have made a stir at the time, since Sordello was a man of some importance. The passage not only settles where Dante places Sordello but also indicates that he knew more of him than his poems. At the end of a varied life Sordello died a violent death, and to this Dante implicitly refers.

That Dante had various sources of information is clear from a passage in the *De vulgari eloquentia*, where in discussing the need for an *illustre vulgare* he considers the Bolognese dialect but, after admitting its merits, comes to the conclusion that it too is not fitted for the highest purposes of poetry. He illustrates his point from Sordello:

Dicimus ergo quod forte non male opinantur qui Bononienses asserunt pulciori locutione loquentes, cum ab Imolensibus, Ferrarensibus, et Mutinensibus circumstantibus aliquid proprio vulgari adsciscunt; sicut facere quoslibet a finitimis suis conicimus, ut Sordellus de Mantua sua ostendit, Cremonae, Brixiae, atque Veronae confini; qui tantus eloquentiae vir existens, non solum in poetando sed quomodo-cunque loquendo patrium vulgare deseruit. [1, 15]

We say, then, that perhaps those are not far wrong who assert that the people of Bologna use a more beautiful speech, since they receive into their own dialect something borrowed from their neighbours of Imola, Ferrara, and Modena, just as we conjecture that all borrow from their neighbours, as Sordello showed with respect to his own Mantua, which is adjacent to Cremona, Brescia, and Verona; and he who was so distinguished by his eloquence, not only in poetry but in every other form of utterance forsook his native vulgar tongue.

The example supports Dante's contention that Italian dialects are not suited to the grand style; Sordello tried first to write in his own vernacular but abandoned it, presumably for Provençal. We know nothing of his work in Italian, since it is doubtful whether a poem claimed for

him by Bertoni is his,⁴ but Dante not only knew his Italian poems but other works, presumably not in verse, or at least knew his reputation as a writer or a speaker. In this, as in other respects, Dante was better informed about Sordello than we are.

Concerning one matter Dante shows a remarkable restraint. He must have known about the elopement with Cunizza and is not likely to have approved of it. Of course, if he said nothing about it, no question would arise; but he comes near to referring to it in the *Paradiso*, when Cunizza, being placed in Venus, explains that she is rightly placed in the star of love and that her former sins no longer distress her:

"Cunizza fui chiamata, e qui refulgo,
Perchè mi vinse il lume d'esta stella;

"Ma lietamente a me medesima indulgo
La cagion di mia sorte, e non mi noia;
Che parria forse forte al vostro vulgo."

(*Par. IX*, 32-36)

Here Dante is a little artful. He would know that any mention of Cunizza would stir his readers to expect some mention of Sordello, but he says nothing of him. Instead he rather tantalizingly makes Cunizza speak of her devotion to another troubadour, Folquet of Marseilles. Dante's silence on Sordello suggests that he has weighed his faults with his virtues and decided that the virtues win.

Yet, though Dante admired Sordello and surely approved of his love poetry, what he liked most seems to have been the courageous expression of political convictions in which Sordello more than once indulged. In the *Purgatorio* Sordello's first function is to provide a starting point for Dante's passionate outburst on the woes of Italy. The abrupt transition is surely dictated by Sordello's own views on such matters and especially by what he says in "L'Ensegnamen d'Onor," where he sets out his notions of chivalrous behavior and his theory of *prez*, or worth. It is by no means the only poem of its kind, nor the best. It is quite legitimate to prefer the "Romans di Mondana Vita" of Folquet de Lunel or the "Four Cardinal Virtues" of Daude de Pradas; and, of course, if Dante himself knew these other poems, he may well have thought them better. But that is no reason for arguing, as some have, that Dante would therefore pay no attention to Sordello's poem, still less that he did not know it.⁵ Since he seems to have been well acquainted with Sordello's writings, we can hardly doubt that he knew this piece. Once he decided to make use of Sordello in the *Divine Comedy*, he would naturally seize on relevant elements in his outlook and especially on those which were expressed at some length in "L'Ensegnamen d'Onor."

⁴ Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, I, 430.

⁵ H. J. Chaytor, *The Troubadours of Dante* (Oxford, 1902), p. 175.

Though the chivalrous ideal set forth in this poem is commonplace in comparison with that of the *Vita Nuova* or even of the *Convito*, with which it has more in common, it certainly says much of which Dante would approve and very little of which he would disapprove. Just as in his shorter poems Sordello makes the ideal love of a woman an important part of his whole conception of honor, so here he bases his philosophy and especially his notions of *prez* and *onor* on the inspiration and challenge which such a love gives. His course is somewhat sluggish and circuitous. He dilates on the love of God and the origin of evil before he reaches the rules of behavior. He does not at first say much about women or love, but that is because he keeps them in reserve. As he draws to his close, he expands upon the relations of women and their lovers and tells how they should bear themselves and what conversation they should hold. Then in the last paragraph he pays a tribute to his own lady, Agradiva, who inspires all that is best in his life. In this poem ideal love is a pivotal point in a system of worth and honor; and, though Sordello does not draw such bold conclusions as Dante would, he is a consistent apologist for the cult of love as a system of life.

In "L'Ensegnamen d'Onor" Sordello proves himself worthy of Dante's respect as a critic of life and politics, whose philosophy is of the kind which Dante himself held and developed. In this we may see Dante's reason for placing his outburst on Italy immediately after Virgil and Sordello have greeted each other as fellow Mantuans. This covers a deeper kinship between them, and Dante draws the moral:

Quell'anima gentil fu così presta,
Sol per lo dolce suon della sua terra,
Di fare al cittadin suo quivi festa;

E ora in te non stanno senza guerra
Li vivi tuoi, e l'un l'altro si rode
Di quei ch'un muro ed una fossa serra.

(*Purg.* VI, 79-84)

Italy is equally dear to Virgil, to Dante, and to Sordello. From his knowledge of Sordello's work Dante advances from the friendly warmth of the greeting to a fierce denunciation, in which he not only says much with which Sordello would agree but even seems to follow with his own vivid variations certain topics with which Sordello deals in his poem.

If we compare Dante's outburst with Sordello's "L'Ensegnamen d'Onor," we may notice several points of similarity, which suggest that Dante has a clear purpose in his abrupt change of subject. There is, it is true, a great difference of manner between the two poets. While Sordello is dry and abstract and theoretical, Dante is vivid and personal and illustrates individual issues with homely or colloquial phrases. But

behind this difference there are considerable resemblances of thought and outlook; indeed each point made by Dante can be paralleled by something said by Sordello. Dante begins by denouncing the disobedience prevalent in Italy and proclaiming the need to let the Emperor rule; Sordello (lines 543 ff.) also lays down the need for an ideal of service and blames those who shun what is right or accept what is not. Dante then blames the German Albert for deserting his duty and calls down judgment from Heaven on him; Sordello (lines 589 ff.) says that a common failing of the great is to be interested in themselves instead of in those whom they rule. Dante ascribes imperial negligence to the avarice of Albert and his father; Sordello (lines 506 ff.) expatiates on the duties of wealth and the need for generosity. In his denunciation of Florence, Dante says that its people have no justice in their hearts, though its name is often on their lips; Sordello (lines 601 ff.) inveighs against those who condemn the faults of others and pay no attention to their own. Dante blames the Florentines for refusing public burdens; Sordello (lines 55 ff.) regards such service as owed to both God and man. Finally, Dante denounces the improvidence which means that what is spun in October does not reach to mid-November; Sordello (lines 489 ff.) regards forethought as the first duty of all rulers. Thus Dante's principles of government, as revealed in his outburst on Italy, may be illustrated almost line by line from Sordello's poem.

This does not mean that Dante necessarily had "L'Ensegnamen d'Onor" before him when he wrote this passage or even that he knew it so well that he was able to adapt its thoughts to his own. But it suggests at least that he knew it and agreed with it and saw in it sufficient justification for making the meeting with Sordello the occasion for a denunciation of Italy and its rulers. It is of course true that other poets expressed ideas very like Sordello's and that, if he had wished, Dante could have used them. But he does not, for a good reason. Sordello appealed to him on more than one account; the appeal of Mantua was in itself sufficient to give Sordello a priority over other politically minded poets and to provide the use of his own appearance for an outburst of Dante's own feelings. The passage is introduced with great skill, both formally and essentially. After the moving character of the meeting between the two Mantuans, what follows comes with an impressive shock of contrast; but the similarity between Sordello's views and Dante's justifies the introduction of a theme which might otherwise do undue violence to the narrative.

In this passage Dante agrees with Sordello on some general principles of politics, though he gives them a particular application, which Sordello does not. Later in the *Purgatorio*, when Dante is concerned with political personalities, he again chooses to follow a model from Sordello. In Canto VII, 83-136, Sordello points out various negligent rulers

who are seated on the grass in the wonderful valley and comments on them and on others who are not present. Here, we can hardly doubt, Dante had in mind Sordello's most famous poem, the *planh* which he wrote on the death of Blacatz and which is so important that it must be quoted in full (from the Hill and Bergin *Anthology*, Yale Romanic Studies, No. XVII):

Planher vuell en Blacatz en aquest leugier so
Ab cor trist e marrit, et ai en be razo,
Qu'en luy ai mescabat senhor et amic bo,
E quar tug l'ayp valent en sa mort perduto so :
Tant es mortals lo dans, qu'ieu noy ai sospeisso
Que jamais si revenha, s'en aital guiza no,
Qu'om li traga lo cor, e qu'en manjol baro
Que vivon descorat, pueys auran de cor pro.

Premiers manje del cor, per so que grans ops l'es,
L'empeaire de Roma, s'elh vol los Milanés
Per forsa conquistar, quar luy tenon conques,
E viu deseretatz, malgrat de sos Ties;
E deseguentre lui manj' en lo reys frances,
Pueys cobrara Castella, que pert per nescies;
Mas, si pez' a sa maire, elh no'n manjara ges,
Quar ben para son pretz qu'elh non fai ren quel pes.

Del rey engles me platz, quar es pauc coratjos,
Que manje pro del cor, pueys er valens e bos,
E cobrara la terra, per que viu de pretz blos,
Quel tol lo reys de Fransa quar lo sap nualhos;
E lo reys castelas tanh qu'en manje per dos,
Quar dos regismes ten, e per l'un non es pros;
Mas, s'elh en vol manjar, tanh qu'en manj' a rescos,
Que, sil mair' o sabia, batria-l ab bastos.

Del rey d'Arago vuel del cor deja manjar,
Que aisso lo fara de l'anta descarguar
Que pren sai de Marcella e d'Amilau, qu'onrar
Nos pot estiers per ren que puesca dir ni far;
Et apres vuell del cor don hom al rey navar,
Que valia mais coms que reys, so aug comtar :
Tortz es quan Dieus fai home en gran ricor pojar,
Pus sofracha de cor lo fai de pretz bayssar.

Al comte de Toloza a ops qu'en manje be,
Sil membra so que sol tener ni so que te,
Quar, si ab autre cor sa perda non reve,
Nom par que la revenha ab aquel qu'a en se.
El coms proensals tanh qu'en manje, sil sove
C'oms que deseretatz viu guaire non val re,
E, sitot ab esforços si defen nis chapte,
Ops l'es mange del cor pel greu fais qu'el soste.

Li baro-m volran mal de so que ieu dic be,
Mas ben sapchan qu'ie'ls pretz aitan pauc quon ylhe me.

Belh Restaur, sol qu'ab vos puesca trobar merce,
A mon dan met quascun que per amic nom te.

Blacatz is dead. In this plain descant I intend
To weep for him, nor care a jot if I offend;
For in him I have lost my master and good friend,
And know that with his death all princely virtues end.
It is a mortal loss, which nought can ever mend,
In truth I so suspect, unless his heart we send
To the great lords to eat. To hearts they can't pretend!
But then they'll have enough of heart to make amend.

First let the Emperor eat. Great need of it is his,
If he would crush by force the rebel Milanese
And force his conquerors to do what he decrees;
Despite his German guards he has no fiefs or fees.
Then let the French king eat, and may-be he will seize
Castile again, which he lost by his idiocies.
But he'll refrain if his good mother disagrees;
Honor, we know, forbids that he should her displease.

I bid the English king, who is so ungallant,
Eat of the heart; then he'll be bold and valiant,
Win back the lands whose loss proclaims him recreant,
All that the French king took, knowing him indolent.
Next the Castilian king enough for two will want;
Two realms has he, but ev'n for one his heart's too scant.
If he would eat, let him be secret and not flaunt;
He'll feel his mother's stick if she learns of his vaunt.

Then of this heart must eat the king of Aragon;
So shall he wash away the shame which he has won
At Marseilles and Milhau; of his lost honor none
Can he recover now, whatever's said and done.
Then unto Navarre's king I bid this heart be shown,—
Better as count than king in my comparison,—
Great pity 'tis when God exalts dominion
For princes who then bid all name and fame be gone.

Next, the Count of Toulouse is in sore need of it,
If he recall what lands he has, of what he's quit,
To win his losses back a new heart he must fit,—
The heart that he has now will mend them not a bit.
Last, the Count of Provence will eat if he admit
That the disinherited are honored not a whit;
Yes, let him do his best himself to benefit;
So burdensome a load he bears that he must eat.

For all these well said words I'll win the great lords' hate,
But let them know I'll pay their knocks back with like weight.

Sweet Comfort, if I find your favor in the end,
I'm little vexed by those who scorn to call me friend.

This unusual poem shows the strength and originality of Sordello's art and makes it easier to understand why Dante forgave him his sins and gave him an honorable part in the *Divine Comedy*.

In the well-regulated world of Provençal poetry Sordello's *planh* has a peculiar place. It has precedents in such pieces as Cercamon's lament for Guillaume of Aquitaine in 1137, or Bertran de Born's for Henry II's son, the "young king," in 1183, or those of Jaucelm Faidit and Giraut de Borneil for Richard Cœur de Lion in 1199. The lament was an ancient form and followed conventional lines, in which the poets usually complain that with the passing of a great man chivalry, valor, and courtesy have vanished from the earth. They do not usually seize the occasion, as Sordello does, to say unpleasant things about the living. But historically he is justified in this, because the *planh* is closely related to the *sirventès*, which is what the Provençal poets use when they wish to criticize their lords and masters or to pass political judgments. Sordello must have known this, and his poem is close to such poems as that written by the younger Bertran de Born against King John in 1204, in which he mocks him for the loss of Poitou and Guyenne, accuses him of betraying his armies, and generally derides his failure. Sordello's originality lies in finding in Blacatz's death an opportunity to say what he feels about the rulers of Europe. If the form allowed some latitude, he took all that he could and made the most of it.

Blacatz, whose death Sordello laments, is not unknown to history. He was seigneur of Aups near Draguignan and is mentioned in several documents after 1194. Himself the author of ten surviving poems, he was also the friend and patron of poets and was praised for his generosity and goodness. Sordello seems to have come into contact with him at the court of Guida, daughter of Henry I, count of Rodez, before 1240. She has been thought to be the "Belh Restaus" to whom he addresses several poems, including the *planh*,⁶ and she is associated with Sordello in the parody of it written by Bertrand d'Alamanon. Though in 1240 Sordello is known to have been at Montpellier, it looks as if he wrote the *planh* when he was back with Guida and addressed it to her because she too had been a friend of the dead man. The freedom with which he speaks sheds an interesting light on the conditions of the time, when a small court like that of Guida could flaunt its opposition to the great powers of Europe. Sordello throws his net wide. In turn he denounces the Emperor Frederick II, Louis IX of France, Henry III of England, Ferdinand III of Castile, James I of Aragon, Thibaut I of

⁶ C. Fabre in *Annales du Midi*, XXIV (1912), 153-184 and 321-354.

Navarre, Raymond VII of Toulouse, and Raymond Berengar V of Provence.

It is not impossible to fix an approximate date for the poem.⁷ The death of Blacatz seems to have coincided with a considerable crisis in western Europe. In 1242 Raymond VII of Toulouse formed a league of southern potentates in the hope of shaking off French suzerainty and received assurances of help from the kings of Castile and Aragon. At the same time Henry III of England set sail for France on May 9 with the ambition of regaining the lands lost by his father. On July 23 he was defeated by Louis IX at Saintes, and, though his army remained for some time in France, it had no hope of success. Despite this Raymond tried to make a treaty with Henry and eventually did so by the end of August. Then in October all went wrong. The count of Foix deserted; the kings of Castile and Aragon held aloof from action; and on October 20 Raymond submitted to Louis. It is a sorry tale, and Sordello takes full advantage of it.

Of his eight rulers five were involved in the revolt, and each is mocked for his failure—Henry III, quite accurately, for lands lost to the French king, not so much what John had already lost but Poitou and Saintonge as far as the Gironde; Ferdinand III for his cowardice in failing to help Raymond VII; James I for still not being master of Marseilles, which ought to have been his on the death of Raymond Berengar IV, and of Milhau, which once belonged to his house but was still in the hands of Toulouse with the connivance of Louis IX and the Pope; Raymond VII of Toulouse for his failure to regain lands lost earlier to Louis; and Raymond Berengar V of Provence for gaining nothing by making up his quarrel with Toulouse and being forced to accept a diminution of his domains. The outbreak of 1242 was largely an attempt to regain territories recently lost; when it failed, these remained with their recent owners and especially with Louis.

To this list Sordello adds three other names, Frederick II, Louis IX, and Thibaut I, who fall in rather a different category, since they were not on the defeated side in the revolt. Frederick could hardly be omitted from a list of living monarchs; and Sordello, who himself came from Lombardy, delights in his continued lack of success with the Milanese, whom he defeated at Cortenuova in 1237 but never subdued. Louis had indeed defeated his enemies in France, but Sordello condemns him for not making the most of his victory and taking Castile, to which he had a reasonable claim through his mother, especially since Ferdinand's mother, Berengaria, was declared not to have been married to his father, Alfonso X of Leon. Finally, since Thibaut of Navarre, formerly count of Champagne, is not known to have joined Raymond VII, Sor-

⁷ A. Jeanroy in *Annales du Midi*, XVI (1904), 311-329; H. J. Chaytor, *The Troubadours and England* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 80-85.

dello probably derides him for his behavior in the recent crusade, when he retreated before the Saracens and took ship home. These three additional names complete Sordello's picture of western Europe governed by poltroons. Although his actual occasion seems to have been the war of 1242, he passes beyond it to a wider view and distributes his blows impartially on eight potentates.

Sordello's *planh* evidently made a considerable mark, since it was soon imitated or parodied by Peire Bremon Ricas Novas and by Bertran d'Alamanon. It also became known in due course to Dante, who was evidently taken by the image of eating the dead man's heart. To this there seems to be no parallel in mediaeval poetry except in poems obviously derived from Sordello. It is conceivable that it comes from folk song or folk tale, since the troubadours were not averse from drawing on such popular sources, but even for this the nearest parallel is no closer than a Greek *τραγούδι* in which an eagle summons other birds to eat of its vitals.⁸ Dante's debt to the *planh* may first be seen in a poem in the *Vita Nuova*, where the figure of Love appears to him in a vision:

Allegro mi sembrava Amor, tenendo
Mio core in mano, e nelle braccia avea
Madonna, involta in un drappo, dormendo.

Poi la svegliava, e d'este core ardendo
Lei paventosa umilmente pascea;
Appresso gir ne lo vedea piangendo.

Dante does not use the image of eating the heart quite as Sordello does; while Sordello insists that it will give strength to the feeble, Dante suggests that his whole being is absorbed in that of his lady. None the less, the two poems are sufficiently similar to justify the conclusion that Dante has borrowed something from Sordello.

If this was the first impression which the *planh* made on Dante, it was not the only one. When he came to write the *Purgatorio*, he was interested not in the image of the heart but in the denunciation of European rulers. If Sordello's poem surveys these about 1242, the speech which Dante gives him covers some forty years of history as seen in retrospect from the ideal date of 1300. Dante uses the presence of the negligent rulers for two purposes, first to comment on those who belong to the class, then to say something, usually unpleasant, about their sons and successors. The negligent rulers named are the Emperor Rudolph, Ottocar of Bohemia, Philip III of France, Henry of Navarre, Peter III of Aragon, Charles I of Anjou, Henry III of England, and William of Montferrat. Only concerning two of these does Dante say enough to

⁸ Passow, *Popularia carmina Graeciae recentioris*, p. 103.

show why they are placed where they are. The Emperor Rudolph is guilty of negligence:

... fa sembianti
D'aver negletto ciò che far dovea.
(*Purg.* VII, 91-92)

In the previous canto he has been associated with his son Albert as being guilty of neglecting their own lands in their covetousness (*Purg.* VI, 97-105), and now Dante stresses the fruit of this policy in the condition of Italy, whose wounds Rudolph might have healed. Dante is also explicit about Philip III of France, who "died in flight, dishonoring the lily"—a reference to Philip's fatal defeat in 1285 by Roger di Loria, the admiral of Peter III of Aragon. However, Dante may have had more than this in mind, since Philip had tried to seize Aragon for his son, Charles of Valois, of whom Dante had a low opinion because of his interference in Florentine politics (*Purg.* XX, 71). So perhaps he here recalls that among Philip's other faults was favoritism to an unworthy son.

Though Dante does not explain why the other kings and princes are classed as negligent, there is no great difficulty. They have all in their own way failed, presumably through some weakness of character, and their failure has led to discord or defeat. Whatever their personal virtues and charms may have been, and Dante is generous enough about them, they have none the less failed in their first duty, which is to rule and keep order. Ottocar of Bohemia has divided the Empire in his struggle with Rudolph of Hapsburg. The policies of Charles of Anjou ended in disaster when he was driven out of Sicily after the Sicilian Vespers, but before that he had caused havoc in Italy (*Purg.* XX, 67 ff.; *Par.* VIII, 73 ff.). Henry III of England, the only figure who appears both in Sordello's poem and here, "il re della semplice vita," is another whose efforts to regain his lost lands have failed and have been followed by civil war. William of Montferrat tried to lead a league against Charles of Anjou, but could not control its members and was ruined when Alessandria rose against him; he was put in a cage where he was kept until his death. Neither Henry of Navarre nor Peter III of Aragon, despite many chivalrous qualities and the admiration of their contemporaries, were really successful kings. The company is well enough chosen and excites little comment. Indeed the only possible criticism of it is that we may feel surprise at Charles of Anjou being so well treated. Elsewhere Dante says of him:

Carlo venne in Italia, e, per vicenda,
Vittima fè di Corradino; e poi
Ripinse al ciel Tommaso, per ammenda.
(*Purg.* XX, 67-69)

The deaths of Conradin and Thomas Aquinas might seem to argue graver faults in Charles than negligence, but for some reason Dante condones them and sets Charles in reasonably good company.

In his choice of negligent rulers Dante follows very much the same principles as Sordello in his *planh*. Each condemns rulers for not ruling and suggests that it is due to a failure of character. With Sordello the failure is simply cowardice; with Dante it is something wider, a failure to sustain responsibility, or something like moral cowardice. He seems to have taken Sordello's idea and expanded it. If Sordello thinks that a king's first duty is to hold all the lands which belong to his house, Dante thinks that it is to govern well what lands he has and not to promote discord. If Sordello insists in the case of Thibaut that elevation to kingship is no reason for lapsing into idleness, Dante throughout implies that rulers have great responsibilities and that the higher their position the more it demands of them. If Sordello regards war as the test of a man's worth, Dante at least regards defeat as a sign of weakness. Finally, it is noteworthy that, while Sordello does not shrink from deriding St. Louis, Dante nowhere finds a place for him in the *Divine Comedy* or even mentions him by name. This king, who seems to us to embody so much that is best in the thirteenth century, evidently did not appeal to Dante. Though the two poets may differ in temperament, they judge rulers by much the same standards and have much the same ideas of what qualities rulers ought to possess.

If part of Sordello's speech is more generous than suits what we know of his character, that is no doubt because Dante wishes to be fair to men like Henry III, who was renowned for his piety, or Peter III, who was praised for his virtue and probity. But Dante was capable of scorn equal to Sordello's and was not afraid to show it when he thought it deserved. He ingeniously makes the sight of the negligent rulers an occasion to mention others who are not present, usually because they are still alive. Of these only two receive favorable comment, Edward I of England, who is a better man than his father, and the eldest son of Peter III of Aragon, who did not reign long enough to make his influence felt. The others mentioned are less worthy—Wenceslas I of Bohemia, Philip the Fair of France, James II of Aragon, his brother Frederick II of Sicily, and Charles II of Naples. If the fathers' faults are pardonable, those of the sons are not. They are men of Dante's own time, concerning whose characters and careers he is well informed and concerning whom he has usually something to say elsewhere in the *Divine Comedy*. So he speaks of Wenceslas:

Che mai valor non conobbe, nè volle.

(*Par.* XIX, 126)

Philip the Fair, "il mal di Francia," with his "vita viziata e lorda" is

accused of abetting simony (*Inf.* XIX, 87), of ruining his country by debasing its coinage (*Par.* XXX, 118), and of being a new Pilate in his treatment of the Church (*Purg.* XX, 91). James II of Aragon is denounced for participating in the foul deeds of his uncle and brother and making cuckold their family and its two kingdoms (*Par.* XIX, 136-138). Frederick II of Sicily is attacked for avarice and baseness (*Par.* XIX, 130); and Charles II of Naples is associated with him, when Dante says that Sicily weeps because they are alive (*Par.* XX, 62), while the same Charles is blamed for selling his daughter (*Purg.* XX, 80). If the fathers were no worse than feeble and indolent, the sons are vicious and bring disaster by their evil behavior.

For this state of affairs Dante offers an explanation. It is, he makes Sordello say, usual for families to get worse as they continue:

Rade volte risurge per li rami
L'umana probitate: e questo vuole
Quei che la dà, perchè da lui s'ì chiami.

(*Purg.* VII, 121-123)

In the *Paradiso* Dante reverts to the question of heredity and comes to a somewhat different conclusion, when Charles Martel explains that the fault lies rather with the assigning of tasks to men who are not naturally fitted for them:

Ma voi torcete alla religione
Tal che fia nato a cignersi la spada,
E fate re di tal ch'è da sermone:

Onde la traccia vostra è fuor di strada.

(*Par.* VIII, 145-148)

An age which had known both Boniface VIII and Henry III might well grant the truth of these words, and they are probably nearer to Dante's own final conclusions than the doctrine of natural decline which he gives to Sordello in the *Purgatorio*. Indeed the doctrine may well have been given to Sordello because it suits his outlook and opinions. Sordello not only says that Louis IX and Ferdinand III are weaker than their mothers, but implies that all his kings and princes are worse than their forefathers, whose lands they are too feeble to hold. The theory of degeneration suits Sordello's critical temper and is aptly attributed to him. If later Dante passes beyond it, this is only another sign that Sordello's view was much to his taste, but that, with his usual gift for improving upon the lessons of his masters, he altered it and adapted it to another, more comprehensive view of history.

Wadham College, Oxford

NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCANDERBEG THEME

B. B. ASHCOM

GEORGE CASTRIOT, the Albanian hero called Scanderbeg, was born early in the fifteenth century.¹ His father, John, lord of Mat and Vumenestia, seems to have been under the somewhat uncertain protection of Venice. He was not allowed to control the city of Croya, and he received no help when the Turkish sultan, Amurath II, sent an army into Albania in 1423. The Albanians were defeated, John Castriot became perforce a vassal of the sultan, and his sons, in accordance with the Turkish recruiting system, joined Amurath's slave family at Adrianople to be trained for service to the Ottoman state.² An early historian of Scanderbeg, Marinus Barletius,³ tells us that the boy was then in his

¹ The best studies of Scanderbeg and his times are to be found in Athanasie Gegaj, *L'Albanie et l'invasion turque au XV^e siècle* (Louvain, 1937), and Bishop F. S. Noli, *George Castrioti Scanderbeg* (New York, 1947). See also: *Acta et Diplomata Res Albaniae Mediae Aetatis*, Vol. II (Vindobonae, 1918); Joseph von Hammer, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 10 vols. (Pest, 1827-1835); Carl Hopf, *Chroniques Gréco-Romanes inédites* (Berlin, 1873); and J. W. Zinkeisen, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa*, 7 vols. (Hamburg, 1840-1863).

² It is not necessary to assume, as is generally done, that the sons were taken as hostages to compel the Albanians to keep the peace. According to von Hammer (I, 484), John Castriot revolted in 1426, when Amurath was in Asia, and was subdued with great difficulty. In January 1433, Bertrandon de la Broquière, "Ecuyer tranchant" of Philip of Burgundy, visited Amurath at Adrianople and expressed surprise to find the sultan meagerly attended. He was told "que ledit Turc avoit envoyé . . . x^m combatans pour prendre et reduire aucuns seigneurs d'Albanie." The expedition referred to was that of Ali Bey to put down another revolt of John Castriot. *Le Voyage d'Outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière . . . publié et annoté par Ch. Schefer* (Recueil de Voyages et de Documents, XII, Paris, 1892), p. 178 and note. Hostages would have suffered for these uprisings. More probably the case was an example of the levying of tribute in the form of able-bodied sons of Christian vassals. This was an essential of the Turkish system of gathering recruits, seldom excited comment, and was not infrequently welcomed by the captive and his family as a chance to rise to wealth and fame. See A. H. Lybyer, *The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 62-89.

³ *Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbegi epirotarum principis* (Rome, 1520?). This basic work was followed, to a greater or less degree, by all later writers on Scanderbeg. It was reprinted as the third volume of Philip Lonicer's *Chronicorum Turcicorum* (Frankfort, 1568). My citations of Barletius refer to the Frankfort, 1578, edition of Lonicer.

ninth year; it is more likely that he was in his twentieth. Once a recruit, circumcised, and inducted into Mohammedanism, George enjoyed the special favor of Amurath and rose rapidly to the position of Sanjak Bey. Much utilized by novelists and dramatists are the stories, first told by Barletius, of the young soldier proving his valor and confounding the envious by vanquishing a gigantic Scythian and later two Persians, and conquering for Amurath the cities of Nicomedia and Brusa. Like the tale of Voisava's dream,⁴ the harangues of Scanderbeg on the eve of battle, and the letters he exchanges with the sultan and with Wladislav of Hungary, the stories are products of the inventive mind of his biographer.

Barletius assures us that, in spite of his apparent conversion to Mohammedanism, Scanderbeg remained a Christian at heart; but there is nothing to show that his Christianity interfered with his exploits as a soldier of Islam. None the less, Amurath began to doubt his loyalty,⁵ and a crisis was reached when John Castriot died, probably in 1443.⁶ Amurath then absorbed the Castriot domain into the Ottoman Empire. It seems to have been this action that determined Scanderbeg to look for an opportunity to escape from the sultan's service. The opportunity came with the defeat of the Turks by the Hungarian, John Hunyady, at Nish on the Morava River. In the confusion of the retreat Scanderbeg sought out the chief secretary of the Belerbey of Roumelia and at dagger's point compelled him to write in the bey's name an order to the vice-governor of Croya, transferring the command of that city to Scanderbeg. The luckless secretary was then killed and Scanderbeg and his nephew, Hamsa, fled to Albania. Safely installed in Croya, Scanderbeg consolidated his position by alliances, local and foreign. His chief allies among the Albanian clansmen were Arianites Comnenus, whose daughter Andronica he married in 1451, Gjin Musachi, and Andrew Thopia. From abroad Scanderbeg could usually count on the aid of Venice, of Hungary, and of Alfonso V, "el Magnánimo," King of Aragon and Naples.⁷

⁴ Voisava, the mother of Scanderbeg, dreamed a short time before the hero's birth that she had been delivered of a dragon that devoured the Ottoman Empire. The affinity of the story with the legendary dream of Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great, is obvious.

⁵ Barletius (ff. 6v-7r) attributes the sultan's suspicions in part to his advanced age, a statement worked into many of the literary utilizations of the Scanderbeg theme. In reality Amurath was the same age as Scanderbeg.

⁶ Gegaj, p. 40. Scanderbeg had three brothers, Reposius, Stanislas, and Constantine. Tradition, followed by literature, has the brothers poisoned by Amurath.

⁷ Alfonso was Scanderbeg's most consistent supporter. See C. Marinescu, *Alphonse, roi d'Aragon et de Naples, et l'Albanie de Scanderbeg* (Bucharest, 1923). According to Jerónimo Zurita, the Aragonese chronicler, the alliance between Scanderbeg and Alfonso began in 1451. In that year Demetrius Paleologue, despot of Roumania, had tried to persuade Alfonso to pull some of his chestnuts out of the fire. At about the same time "Con mejor fe que la deste Prin-

Scanderbeg's life after 1443 was spent in repelling one Turkish invasion after another. Amurath wanted Albania anyway, and an Albania controlled by a turncoat bey was an especially attractive object of attack. Only two periods of peace broke the otherwise constant warfare, one following the Treaty of Szeged in 1444 and another during a truce signed in 1461. In all this time Scanderbeg was defeated only twice, at Sfetigrad in 1449⁸ and at Berat in 1456. He routed Turkish armies approximately once a year for nearly a quarter of a century, and his stronghold, Croya, held out against repeated sieges, two led in person by the sultan.⁹ Christian Europe rejoiced at Scanderbeg's success, and his reputation grew apace. His foreign allies, however, always excepting Alfonso of Naples, were more enthusiastic than helpful, and his own kingdom was not without internal dissension. Moses Comnenus, a relative and one of his best commanders, deserted to the Turks, and Hamsa also turned traitor. But neither of the defections was permanent and the deserters were not entirely to blame. Scanderbeg was something less than the spotless "soldier of Jesus Christ" that Barletius likes to call him. Unscrupulous and violent, he was not above dispossessing his weaker compatriots of their states. In view of the heroic perfection of the literary Scanderbeg, the picture of the historic original sketched in 1510 by Giovanni Musachi, the son of his ally, is of special interest:

... dopo che fù capitano generale delli Signori d'Albania, da li a poco spatio di tempo tende designio d'insignorir se de tutto quello paese, fè prigionie il Signor Giovanni e il Signor Coico Balsa fratelli e li mandò al re Ferrante vecchio in Napoli, chi li tenesse prigionie, e li tolse il stato loro ch'era trà Croia et Alesio, dico il paese della Misia. Tolse anco al Signor Moise Commeno il stato suo, quale era en la Dibra, il quale Moise era huomo de core e che valeva, non possendo sopportare tal violentia, se n'andò al Turco, il quale Turco li fè capitano d'un suo esercito e lo mandò contra Scanderbeg, ma depoi li mandò a dire, che hitornasse, che lo teneria de fratello, e Moise conoscendo che lui stava mal sicuro col Turco,

cipe, procuro de confederarse con el Rey Iorge Castrioto, señor de Croya: principal ciudad de Illyrico: al qual por su gran valor llamaron los Turcos Scanderbeg. Este principe embio por sus embaxados al Rey, a Estewan, Obispo de Croya, y fray Nicolas de Berguzi... en su nombre y de toda aquella casa de los Castriots, que eran grandes señores en Albania... Este fue estando el Rey en Gaeta, a veynte y seys del mes de março: y con el favor y amparo del Rey, estando su estado mas vezino al reyno, se sustentaron el y los de aquel linage mucho tiempo." *Anales de la Corona de Aragón Compuestos por Gerónimo Çurita* (Çaragoça, 1610), III, xv, 60.

⁸ The city was captured by the Turks. Like the "old age" of Amurath, the legend of Mahomet, the sultan's son, basely urging his father to slaughter the Sfetigrad garrison as it retired under safe-conduct found favor with dramatists and novelists.

⁹ By Amurath II in 1450 and by Mahomet II in 1466. The first siege began in April and lasted until winter, when Amurath gave up in disgust and retired to Adrianople. He died shortly after, while celebrating Mahomet's marriage. This siege, used as a background for nearly all the Scanderbeg novels and plays, gave rise to another misstatement of fact considered by authors more picturesque than the truth. The sultan was said to have died before the walls of Croya, maddened by rage and grief. See Barletius, f. 117r.

anco per non ingrandir quello con sangue de' Christiani, se ne ritornò. Et essendo morto mio padre, ce tolse anco a noi la Tomonista, cioè Mosachia minore.¹⁰

Scanderbeg, like his kinsman, was evidently "huomo de core e che valeva." He was also a man of seemingly limitless energy and endurance, but even his iron constitution could not stand indefinitely the strain to which it was subjected. His allies fell away, intriguing against one another, while the Turk pressed ever nearer the Adriatic. In 1468, while Scanderbeg was at Alessio conferring with the heads of the Albanian clans, he became ill. In a few days the Alessian swamps had done what Amurath and Mahomet could not do, and Scanderbeg was dead.¹¹ Mahomet, meeting little resistance, made himself master of the whole country from the Bay of Vlona north to Scutari. Scanderbeg's wife and son, John, fled to Naples, where John was made Duke of San Pietro and Marquis of Soletto. In Albania there remained only the memory of the man who had for twenty-five years held at bay the might of two sultans.¹²

George Castriot was soon a familiar figure in the pages of chronicles and histories.¹³ Shortly after his death there was published an anonymous *Scanderbegi Historia*,¹⁴ and early in the next century appeared Marinus Barletius' *Historia*, already mentioned. Translations of Barletius were made almost immediately. One is found in German in 1533,¹⁵

¹⁰ Hopf, pp. 299-300.

¹¹ Scanderbeg was buried at Alessio. According to a tradition frequently appearing in Scanderbeg literature, his tomb was violated by the Turks, who sought his bones as amulets.

¹² The memory of Scanderbeg still lives in folk tales and ballads, some of which say that he lived for four hundred years, finally to be killed by a jealous woman; others, that after a life of several centuries he died "with all his teeth in his mouth." See Konrad Bercovici, *The Incredible Balkans* (New York, 1932), pp. 128-130.

¹³ See Georges T. Petrovich, *Scanderbeg, Essai de bibliographie raisonnée* (Paris-Vienna, 1881). Many of Petrovich's entries need correction, and, at least in the Spanish and English fields, his list is by no means complete. I hope to complete and correct the Spanish section in a later article which will treat of the utilization of Scanderbeg's biography in Spanish literature.

¹⁴ *Scanderbegi Historia. Explicit Historia Scanderbegi edita per quendam Albanensem. Venetiis impressa industria atque impensa Erhardi Ratdolt de Augusta anno Domini 1480.* The author was probably a cleric of Antivari. The work was followed closely by Giammaria Biemmi in his *Istoria di Giorgio Castrioto detto Scanderbegh* (Brescia, 1742), but aside from this it seems never to have been reprinted or translated, or even known to most historians. Gegaj, who uses it extensively, through Biemmi's *Istoria* (see his introduction, p. viii), considers it more critical than Barletius. On this volume see Georgius V. Panzer, *Annales Typographici* (Nuremberg, 1793-1803), III, 155; Georg W. Zapf, *Augsburgs Buchdruckergeschichte* (Augsburg, 1788-1791), I, 255; Noli, *op cit.*, pp. 77-78.

¹⁵ *Des aller streytparsten fürsten Georgen Castriotens genaüt Scanderbeg... In Latein beschreiben un yetz durch Joannê Pinicianû neulich verteutscht* (Augsburg, Heinrich Steiner, 1533). There were several editions of the Pinicianus translation printed at Augsburg and Frankfurt. A second German translation was the work of T. F. Unger (Magdeburg, J. Francken, 1604 and 1606) and a third was by Gabriel Tzschimmern (Dresden, A. Löffler, 1664).

one in Italian in 1554,¹⁶ and one in Portuguese in 1567.¹⁷ In France Barletius was translated and expanded by Jacques de Lavardin, Seigneur de Plessis-Bourrot, in a work first published in 1576.¹⁸ The book was adorned by a sonnet from Ronsard, an ode from Amadis Jamyn, and a list of authorities on which the author says he drew.¹⁹ While most of these authorities furnished Lavardin with no material, there are passages in his *Histoire* that do not occur in Barletius. On October 12, 1593, the London printer, William Ponsonby, entered the Lavardin translation in the Stationers' Register under its French title. There is no record of its having been printed, but in 1596 Ponsonby brought out an English version, the *Historie of George Castriot, surnamed Scanderbeg . . . newly translated out of French into English by Z. I., Gentleman*.²⁰ This is the first appearance of the Barletius chronicle in English, although some years earlier Scanderbeg had appeared in an anonymous work and in the *Commentaries* of Paulus Jovius, Englished by Peter Ashton in 1546.²¹

The story of Scanderbeg, spread abroad by versions of Barletius' *Historia*, also occupied an important place in the histories of the Ottoman Empire popularized by the universal interest in things Turkish. Chalcocondylas, Paulus Jovius, Andrea Cambini, Francesco Sansovino, and Richard Knolles all devoted many pages to the Albanian hero.²² As

¹⁶ *Historia del magnanimo et valeroso Signor Giorgio Castrioto detto Scanderbego . . . per Pietro Rocca novamente tradotta* (Venice, 1554). There were several later editions.

¹⁷ *Chronica do valeroso Príncipe e inuenciuel Capitão Iorge Castrioto senhor dos Epirenses . . . trasladada em Portugues por Francisco Dandrade* (Lisbon, Marco Borges, 1567). This Portuguese version was in turn translated into Spanish by Juan Ochoa de la Salde and printed first at Lisbon in 1588 and then at Madrid in 1597.

¹⁸ *Historie de Georges Castriot, surnommé Scanderbeg, roy d'Albanie . . .* (Paris, G. Chaudière, 1576). There were ten impressions before 1621.

¹⁹ Petrovich mentions nineteen, the number listed in my copy of the English translation of 1596. The French edition I have examined (Francheville, J. Arnauld, 1604) lists thirty-four.

²⁰ Like the French work, this translation is prefaced by laudatory verse, with a sonnet from no less a personage than Edmund Spenser. Ponsonby issued both parts of the *Faerie Queen*, the second in 1596, and no doubt solicited the puff from his client. Z. I.'s translation (the translator's identity remains unknown) is the source of what is, so far as I know, the only American work on Scanderbeg. This is *George Castriot, surnamed Scanderbeg, King of Albania* (New York, 1850), by Clement Clark Moore, better known as the author of *The Night before Christmas*.

²¹ *Orationes of Arsans against Philip . . . and of Scanderbeg, prayeng ayde of Christian Princes against periuorous Murderyng Mahumet and against the old false Christian Duke Mahumet's confederate* (London, John Daye, 1560); *A short Treatise upon the Turke's Chronicles . . . translated out of Latyne by Peter Ashton* (London, 1546).

²² Chalcocondylas' *De Origine et Rebus gestis Turcorum libri decem nuper e Gracco in Latinum conversi* (Basiliae, J. Herold, 1556) was translated into French (1577) and reprinted several times, with continuations. Jovius (1483-1552),

the power of the Turks waned in the last half of the seventeenth century, there came a corresponding decrease in the number of books about them and about Scanderbeg. The decline continued through the eighteenth century. Belin de Monterzi published an *Abrégé de l'histoire . . . de Scanderbeg* (Berlin, 1777) and a Frenchman, Richer, was moved to some *Pensées ingénieuses sur les aventures de Scanderbeg* which he published at Rouen in 1750. There is little more. Since 1800, besides occasional books and articles, there have been two brief revivals of interest in Scanderbeg, one during the Greek wars for independence, the other at the time of the Crimean War.²³

With his exploits being recounted in every European language, it did not take long for George Castriot to step from history to literature. His life story was sufficiently heroic to furnish a theme for epic poetry; with some unhistoric sentimental accretion, he was ready to play a role in novel and drama.²⁴ The literary utilizations of the Scanderbeg motif are as widely scattered in space and time as are the chronicles of Scanderbeg's life. The Barletius history was printed at Rome in the first quarter of the sixteenth century; in the last quarter of the century the poetry of Scaramelli²⁵ was published at Carmagnola, followed soon by Margherita Sarrochi's *La Scanderbeide*.²⁶ In Germany, where Barletius was many times translated, we find a Latin poem on Scanderbeg in the seventeenth century and in the nineteenth one in the vernacular.²⁷ The

Bishop of Nocera, wrote voluminously. His *Commentario delle cose de' Turchi da Orcana circa 1328 a Selim circa il 1512* (Venice, 1531) went through as many editions and was translated as often as the Barletius chronicle. Cambini's *Della Origine de' Turchi et Imperio degli Ottomani* (Florence, 1529) was translated into English, along with an anonymous Italian history of Scanderbeg, by John Shute—*Two very notable Commentaries* (London, R. Hall for H. Toye, 1562). Sansovino's *Historia universale dell'origine et imperio de' Turchi* (Venice, 1560) went through nine editions in the ensuing century. There were seven printings of Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes from the first beginning of that nation to the Rising of the Ottoman Familie, Together with the Lives and Conquest of the Ottoman Kings and Emperors* (London, A. Islip, 1603) up to 1701.

²³ A. Papadopulo Vreto's *Compendio della storia di Scanderbeg . . . tradotto dal Greco moderno* (Naples, 1820) is a result of the first. The Crimean War inspired C. P. A. Paganel's *Histoire de Scanderbeg, ou Turcs et chrétiens au XV^e siècle* (Paris, 1855).

²⁴ Scanderbeg is usually shown in love with the daughter of one of his allies, a reflection of the historical fact that his wife, Andronica, was the daughter of Arianites Comnenus, head of a clan always close to the Castriots. Complications are caused by the unrequited love for Scanderbeg of a Turkish woman, sometimes one of the sultan's wives, sometimes a daughter. On Scanderbeg's marriage, see Noli, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

²⁵ Baldassare Scarmelli, *Due Canti del poema heroico di Scanderbeg . . . con altre rime e prose* (Carmagnola, 1585).

²⁶ Rome, 1606. J. de la Farge's one-act *Le Cercle des Femmes Savantes* (1663) mentions among women whom later generations will not forget, "Olivia Sarrochia de Naples, qui a écrit la vie de Scanderbeg."

²⁷ Jacobus Kockert, *Scanderbegus . . . De Georgii Castrioti vita et morte* (Lubecae, 1643). Fr. Albert Franz von Nidda, *Skanderbeg: heroisches Gedicht in zehn Gesängen* (Halle, 1823).

Swedes, in 1788, could read of Scanderbeg in an anonymous history in their own language; not long after, they could see him in their theaters, with "Murad," "Zulma hans Dotter," and the supporting "Janitscharrer."²⁸ The United States met the Albanian in the stilted prose of Clement Clarke Moore;²⁹ in 1873 he appeared as the hero of the Spanish Jew's second tale in Longfellow's *Tales of a Wayside Inn*.

England and France welcomed Scanderbeg most warmly. In France, Montaigne, to illustrate how "par divers moyens on arrive à pareille fin," tells a story about "Scanderberch, prince de l'Epire."³⁰ The source is Paulus Jovius. Another reference to Scanderbeg in Montaigne is in the essay (II, xxxix), "Observations sur les Moyens de faire la Guerre de Iulius Caesar." This time the source is Lavardin. Later there was a moment when it seemed that France might witness a cycle of Scanderbeg family romances, for a novel about an "arrière-neveu de Scanderbeg" appeared in Paris in 1631.³¹ This danger, however, did not materialize; the two other novels of the seventeenth century revert to Scanderbeg himself. In 1644 Urbain Chevreau³² published his two-volume *Scanderbeg* (Paris, T. Quinet et N. de Sercey), and forty-four years later Mlle de la Roche Guilhem wrote *Le Grand Scanderberg*.³³ With these two novels we shall deal in greater detail below. After 1688 the Scanderbeg theme was given a short rest, to be revived in the eighteenth century on the stage, in the lyric drama, *Scanderberg*, of Antoine Houdart de la Motte.³⁴ This play offers the usual plot.³⁵ Scanderbeg is loved

²⁸ *Skanderbeg. Historiskt Skadespel i tre akter af F. G. Rudbeck* (Stockholm, 1853).

²⁹ See note 20.

³⁰ *Essais*, I, i. On the general subject of French use of "la matière de Turquie," see Clarence Dana Rouillard, *The Turk in French History, Thought and Literature* (Paris, 1940).

³¹ Octavio Finelli, *Histoire Nègre-Pontique, contenant la vie et les amours d'Alexandre Castriot... et d'Olimpe, la belle Grèce de la maison des Paléologues... tirée des manuscrits d'Octavio Finelli. Le tout mis en ordre et donné au public par J. Baudoin* (Paris, T. du Bray, 1631). The author was neither "Octavio Finelli" nor J. Baudoin, but Pierre de Boissat, fils.

³² The life (1613-1701) of this dramatist, novelist, and bibliophile of taste and discrimination is of more than usual interest. See Gustave Boissière, *Urbain Chevreau. Sa vie, ses œuvres. Etude biographique et critique...* (Niort, 1910).

³³ *Le Grand Scanderberg. Nouvelle par Mlle. **** A Amsterdam, chez Pierre Savouret dans le Kalver-sstraat. MDCLXXXVIII. Note the spelling: *Scanderberg*. European adaptations of the name (from the Turkish version of *Alexander*—Iskender or Iskander—plus the title, *Bey*) are notably capricious. In English we find *Scanderbeg*, *Scanderberg*, *Scanderbarge*, and *Scanderbags*.

³⁴ *Scanderberg. Tragédie. Représentée pour la première fois par l'Académie royale de Musique, le jeudi vingt-sept Octobre, 1735. Musique de MM. Rebel et Francœur*. The play was printed in *Œuvres de Monsieur Houdart de la Motte* (Paris, 1753-1754), VII, 195-249. Favorably received in 1735, it was revived on Oct. 22, 1763, at Fontainebleau, for Louis XV and his queen.

³⁵ The cast, however, is astonishing. Besides the five major and five minor characters, we see a "Troupe de Bostangis" and of "Grecs et Grèques," of "Janissaires," of "Odaliques," of "Imams," of "Esclaves de différentes nations de

by Roxane, Sultan Amurath's favorite wife, but loves Servilie, princess of Serbia, sent to Amurath's court as a hostage by her defeated father. Roxane plans to kill the sultan³⁶ but, when she is repulsed by Scanderbeg, she reveals to Amurath Servilie's love for the Albanian. Amurath, now "the Raging Turk,"³⁷ orders the death of Scanderbeg, who is saved only by the suicide of Servilie.

Paul Ulric Dubuisson, who followed La Motte with *Scanderbeg; tragédie*, in 1786, was either less talented or less lucky than his predecessor. To quote a contemporary reviewer, at a critical moment in the play, with Scanderbeg and Atalide, the sultan's daughter, engaged in a genteel struggle for Amurath's dagger, "Les murmures du Public ont forcé les comédiens à faire baisser la toile, et les spectateurs ont ignoré ce que pouvoient devenir Mahomet, Atalide, et Scanderbeg."³⁸

In England, as in France, the literary utilizations of the Scanderbeg motif in the eighteenth century took the form of drama. But Scanderbeg had long since become a character familiar to the English public. He figures in a seventeenth-century saying, "Scanderbeg's sword must have Scanderbeg's arm";³⁹ a "Captain Scanderbeg" appears in James Shirley's *Honor and Mammon*; the legendary fate of the hero's bones is referred to by Richard Lovelace⁴⁰ and later by Dryden;⁴¹ and in several Restoration plays he is the subject of allusions the understanding of

l'un et de l'autre sexe," with "deux Scithes, une Asiatique, et une Italienne" for good measure. There was, of course, much doubling; a Mlle Eremans, for example, was kept busy appearing in the Prologue as "Melpomène," and in the play as "une Sultane," "une odalisque," and "une Asiatique."

³⁶ She is careful to keep the unities in mind: "Roxane: Ce jour même Amurath expire dans ces lieux." *Œuvres*, VII, p. 225.

³⁷ "Amurath: Régnez, haine, fureur, / Régnez, jalouse rage, / ... / Je ne me connois plus, je suis tout à la rage." *Œuvres*, VII, p. 240.

³⁸ *Mercur de France*, samedi, 20 mai, 1786, p. 140. Dubuisson, soured by his experience, published his play at Brussels the same year, with the eloquent title, *Scanderberg, tragédie en cinq actes en vers ... mutilée sur la Théâtre François le 9 mai 1786, et ensuite dévorée par les journalistes*.

³⁹ That this proverbial saying was fairly well known is shown by its use in a sermon to the House of Commons by John Langley in 1644. One of the minister's phrases was, "The worde set on by the spirit, as Scanderbags' sword by the arme of Scanderbags, will make a deepe impression." See *Notes and Queries*, I, vii, 35. The saying derives from an apocryphal tale of Scanderbeg's sending Mahomet II a sword that no one at the sultan's court could handle. When accused of bad faith, Scanderbeg replied that he had sent only the sword, not the hand and arm needed to wield it. The story appears in Lavardin (p. 497 of Z. I.'s English translation). It could also have been read in a popular commonplace book, *The Walking Library, or Meditations and Observations written in Latin by P. Camerarius ... and done into English by John Molle, Esq.* (London, A. Islip, 1621), IV, xvi, 299.

⁴⁰ See Lucasta. *The Poems of Richard Lovelace, Esq. now first edited ... by W. Carew Hazlitt* (London, 1864), p. 251.

⁴¹ In "Epistle to the Whigs" prefacing *The Medall. A Satyre against Sedition by the Author of Absalom and Achitophel* (London, J. Tonson, 1682).

which necessitated familiarity with his story.⁴² Such familiarity no doubt resulted from knowledge of the chronicles and histories, since the single literary use of the Scanderbeg theme in Elizabethan times seems not to have exerted much influence on the public mind. The title of this now lost work, *The true historye of George Scanderbarga*, "as yt was lately played by the right honorable the Earl of Oxenford his servantes," was entered in the Stationers' Register on July 3, 1601, but there is no record of its having been printed nor is the author known.⁴³

From 1601 to 1733 Scanderbeg appeared on no English stage. Then came three Scanderbeg plays in rapid succession. On March 15, 1733, William Havard's *Scanderbeg*⁴⁴ was presented at Goodman's Fields; on January 13, 1735, George Lillo's *The Christian Hero*⁴⁵ opened in Drury Lane; and in 1747 Thomas Whincop's unacted *Scanderbeg*, written before 1730, was printed in London.⁴⁶ The printing of this work capped, although it did not settle, an argument that had been going on since the staging of Havard's play. The play was a failure, and

... what might contribute to its ill success was, probably, a report which was spread about the town, that it was a surreptitious plagiarism from Mr. Whincop's play, then in the hands of Mr. Giffard, the manager; a report which obliged Mr. Havard to disavow his ever having seen the rival play, in which he was supported by the testimony of Mr. Giffard.⁴⁷

Havard's play certainly owes nothing to Whincop.⁴⁸ Both are somewhat worse than mediocre examples of classical heroic tragedy, but their simi-

⁴² See Thomas Duffet, *The Mock Tempest*, I, i; Otway, *The Atheist*, I, i. For other Scanderbeg allusions in English literature, see S. C. Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose* (New York, 1937), pp. 474-478.

⁴³ The play has been attributed to Marlowe. See F. G. Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama* (London, 1891), II, 64-66; E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), IV, 400; John Bakeless, *The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), II, 269, 284-285. On Marlowe's knowledge of the Scanderbeg story and his utilization of certain of its aspects in *Tamburlaine*, see Bakeless, I, 218, and *Tamburlaine the Great*, ed. U. M. Ellis-Fermor (New York, 1930), notes, *passim*.

⁴⁴ *Scanderbeg: A Tragedy. As it is Acted at the Theatre in Goodman's Fields. By Mr. Havard* (London, J. Watts, 1733).

⁴⁵ *The Christian Hero: A Tragedy. As it is acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane* (London, John Gray, 1735).

⁴⁶ *Scanderbeg: or, Love and Liberty. A Tragedy. Written by the late Thomas Whincop, Esq. To which are added a List of all the Dramatic Authors, with some Account of their Lives, and of all the Dramatic Pieces ever published in the English Language, to the year 1747* (London, W. Reeve, 1747). According to Watt (*Bib. Brit.*, s. v. Whincop), Whincop was a D.D. and rector of St. Mary Abchurch in London. He died in 1730.

⁴⁷ *Biographia Dramatica, or A Companion to the Playhouse ... by David Erskine Baker, Isaac Reed ... and Stephen Jones* (London, 1812), III, 242.

⁴⁸ Havard's plot is entirely unlike Whincop's; the only verbal similarity I have noticed is that Whincop's subtitle, *Love and Liberty*, is incorporated in a line of Havard (*op. cit.*, p. 4). However, Charles Johnson had written a play, on a different subject, with the title *Love and Liberty*, in 1709.

larity in this respect will not convict William Havard of plagiarism.⁴⁹

George Lillo, too, was suspected of having stolen from Whincop. John Mottley, editor of the Whincop play, takes no pains to hide his suspicion. After paying his respects to Havard,⁵⁰ Mottley tells us that Whincop's widow showed Lillo her husband's play, and asked him "to fill up a small Chasm left by the Author in one part of it." Lillo replied that his inferior style would at once be evident. "However, this very modest Gentleman, having seen the Piece before us, and knowing too that the Author's Widow had a great Dependence on it, soon after brought out a Tragedy founded on the same story and called it *The Christian Hero*." This heavy sarcasm should not be taken too seriously. Lillo was not a plagiarist. His play, by far the best of the three—and good not only by comparison with the others—has in common with Whincop's *Scanderbeg* only the fact that one of Scanderbeg's allies, with his daughter, Scanderbeg's fiancée (in Whincop, Arianites and Arianissa), is captured by Amurath. But in Whincop the two are not captured at the same time, and Amurath wants Arianissa for his harem; he does not use her to bargain for the surrender of Croya. Moreover, there is no similarity between Lillo's Hellena, Amurath's daughter, and Whincop's Selimana, the sultan's wife, who tries to poison Arianissa, only to be forced into suicide by Amurath. Lillo's Amasie (a renegade, the historical Hamsa, Scanderbeg's nephew) is absent from Whincop, who makes much of the love of Thopia, one of Scanderbeg's generals, for the hero's sister Amissa. There is no hint of this subplot in Lillo. If Mottley is to be believed, Lillo did examine Whincop's manuscript. But he seems to have remembered little of what he read. *The Christian Hero* cannot be said to have been stolen from Whincop's *Scanderbeg* on the basis of one parallel situation, the action of which is differently motivated and differently executed.

That Lillo and Havard should have been attacked as plagiarists by Whincop's relatives and partisans is especially ironic in view of the fact (not hitherto pointed out, as far as I am aware) that Whincop's play contains scarcely one original situation. Furthermore, Whincop did not depend on his own inspiration even for his language. For both plot and language he drew on the novel of Mlle de la Roche Guilhem, *Le Grand*

⁴⁹ Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830* (Bath, 1832), III, 400, says that Havard based his play "on a novel of the same name." Can this have been Chevilly's *Scanderbeg, ou les Aventures du Prince d'Albanie* (Paris, 1732), a copy of which I have been unable to consult?

⁵⁰ Havard's hero "has nothing to shew him to be Scanderbeg but his Name," and the author "has shewn himself so little acquainted with the Turkish History in General, as well as that particularly of the Hero, whose name he has given, for no manner of Reason in the World, to the Play, that he lays the scene at or near Constantinople, which was not taken by the Turks till near fourscore years after the death of Scanderbeg." Mottley's acquaintance with the "Turkish History in Particular" needs no comment.

Scanderberg, first printed in French in 1688, and translated into English in 1690 and again in 1721.⁵¹

Whincop's opening scene initiates the parallelism with La Roche Guilhem. Scanderbeg has returned to Croya, leaving in Adrianople the captive Arianissa. In a valley near the city his friend Uranes urges him to forget his fiancée long enough to prepare for resistance against Amurath, who is advancing to the siege.⁵² The conversation is interrupted by groans.

A murther'd wretch
Lies welt'ring in his gore.⁵³

This is La Roche Guilhem's "homme noyé dans son sang,"⁵⁴ and in novel and play Scanderbeg recognizes him as Aradin, a former tutor. On his body is a letter from Amurath to his vizier, Orchan. Compare Whincop's version with the French:

My love at last gives place to rage. Go, Orchan
Go, let the ungrateful Arianissa fall
A sacrifice t'appease our just revenge,
For having made me sigh so long in vain;
The remnant of my flame her blood shall quench.
These our commands are absolute.⁵⁵

Mon Amour vient enfin de céder à ma colère... Allez, Orchan, allez sacrifier l'ingrate Arianisse à la honte de m'avoir fait soupirer inutilement. Son sang éteindra le reste de mes feux... c'est l'ordre absolu d'Amurat.⁵⁶

Aranit, Arianissa's father, now joins the party and the three bewail what they believe to be the captive's fate. Uranes is not without hope.

Perhaps the Sultan's order's not performed;
And Arianissa lives: for sure just heav'n
Could ne'er permit a deed so barbarous.⁵⁷

⁵¹ *The Great Scanderberg: A Novel. Done out of French* (London, R. Bentley, 1690); this is Vol. XI of a collection called *Modern Novels*, published 1679-1692. *Scanderbeg the Great. Translated from the French Original*, contained on pp. 279 ff. of *A Select Collection of Novels. Volume the Fifth* (London, John Watts, 1721). A bibliographical question is here involved which it may be well to settle. Neither translation names the author. Most bibliographies and catalogues list both as from the French of Urbain Chevreau. Esdaile, *A List of English Tales and Prose Romances printed before 1740* (London, 1912), pp. 198, 258, attributes the first translation, correctly, to the French of La Roche Guilhem, the second to "La Roche Guilhem or Urbain Chevreau." The fact is that both are translations of La Roche Guilhem, and the novel of La Roche Guilhem is entirely different from the *Scanderbeg* of Chevreau. For a detailed analysis of the latter see Boissière, *op cit.*, pp. 155-180.

⁵² Uranes is the historic Count Urana, one of Scanderbeg's generals. See Gegaj, p. 119, note 2.

⁵³ Whincop, p. 7.

⁵⁴ La Roche, p. 9.

⁵⁵ Whincop, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁶ La Roche, pp. 11-12. An omitted sentence warns Orchan against Mussulman, the "Bostangi-Bassa," or head gardener, in love with Arianissa. Whincop does not mention the Bassa, whom he calls Alibec, before the third act.

⁵⁷ Whincop, p. 12.

La Roche Guilhem gives this speech to the father. "Son ordre barbare n'a peut-être pas été exécuté, et je ne sçaurois me persuader que la justice du ciel voulût permettre un pareil sacrifice."⁵⁸ Scanderbeg, however, is convinced that his fiancée is dead, and thinks only of vengeance. In Whincop he says,

Thy blood shall be reveng'd; each precious drop
Repaid with torrents.⁵⁹

In La Roche Guilhem, "Vengeons l'innocente Arianisse par des torrens de sang Ottoman."⁶⁰ Disposing of Aradin's body,⁶¹ they now return to Croya.

Act II transfers the scene to Amurath's camp, near Croya, where we find a surprisingly lively Arianissa pursued by the amorous sultan. Selimana, one of Amurath's wives in love with Scanderbeg, burns with jealous rage. Arianissa not only is responsible for the sultan's indifference to Selimana, but also stands between her and Scanderbeg. The sultan's son, Chahasen, is introduced in this act to complicate matters by his passion for Arianissa.⁶² The act continues the parallelism with *Le Grand Scanderbeg*. With the exception of one or two incidents kept back for a dialogue between Arianissa and Amissa in Act V, Whincop has merely condensed and brought forward to the present, and to Croya, what Scanderbeg in the novel tells Thopia of his and Arianissa's adventures in Adrianople.

It is the same in Acts III, IV, and V. In Amurath's camp, Aranit, now a prisoner, defies Amurath and reproaches him for having killed Arianissa. "Hold," exclaims Amurath, "forbear; thy daughter lives, Thy Arianissa lives."⁶³ In La Roche Guilhem his exclamation is, "Arête . . . et ne me reproche point un crime que je n'ai pas commis. Arianisse vit."⁶⁴ Next, Aranit refuses to persuade Arianissa to look more kindly upon the sultan, whereupon Amurath replies, "Then wear thy chains,"⁶⁵ La Roche Guilhem's "Demeure dans mes fers."⁶⁶ The sultan now threatens Arianissa.

⁵⁸ La Roche, p. 90.

⁵⁹ Whincop, p. 13.

⁶⁰ La Roche, p. 89.

⁶¹ Even for such a minor detail, Whincop leans on La Roche Guilhem. Scanderbeg says (p. 14): "I see a party of our troops / Upon the scout, not far; command they bear / The body of unhappy Aradin to Croya." Cf. ". . . ce ne fut pas sans songer au corps d'Aradin. Plusieurs cavaliers Albanois qui parcouroient les environs de Croye, pour observer les Turcs, l'emportèrent par l'ordre de leur Roi" (p. 13).

⁶² The sultan's son is called Mahomet in La Roche Guilhem. Whincop makes only two changes in nomenclature.

⁶³ Whincop, p. 37.

⁶⁴ La Roche, p. 99.

⁶⁵ Whincop, p. 37.

⁶⁶ La Roche, p. 100.

If thou continu'st still inexorable,
Still cruel and unkind, I will not answer
How far my just resentment may transport me.⁶⁷

In the French he says, "Si vous êtes toujours la même, je ne vous répons point de mes emportemens."⁶⁸ Aranit and Arianissa meet and lament their fate in lines slightly more lachrymose than those of La Roche Guilhem but sufficiently similar to be called in many places a translation. Compare the following passages:

Arian: Oh! mournful interview! do I but see thee
To bid a last adieu, to part forever? . . .
Aran: Cease to lament, and moderate thy sorrows;
Assuage thy griefs; remember Scanderbeg
Is near at hand, think on his gen'rous soul,
Think on his prowess.⁶⁹

"Ne vous ai-je donc revu, que pour vous dire un éternel adieu?" s'écria-t-elle douloureusement . . . "Soyez plus modérée," reprit le Prince. Nous sommes à la vue de Scanderbeg, vous sçavez ce que peut sa valeur."⁷⁰

I forbear citing further parallel passages.⁷¹ It is evident that Whincop not only followed La Roche Guilhem's plot closely, but also, wherever possible, depended upon her for his dialogue. Few plays are so completely lacking in originality. The relatives and friends of the rector of St. Mary Abchurch should have been more chary of accusing other dramatists of plagiarism.⁷²

As we have seen, after the middle of the eighteenth century the curve of Scanderbeg's appearances in histories and chronicles began to decline. His appearances in literature also declined, and more rapidly. As the Turk receded from the European imagination, Scanderbeg's literary fortunes sank. In France there is record of an anonymous school play,

⁶⁷ Whincop, p. 46.

⁶⁸ La Roche, p. 107.

⁶⁹ Whincop, p. 49.

⁷⁰ La Roche, p. 106.

⁷¹ Whincop's borrowing of language continues to the end. Here (p. 60) Arianissa tells Scanderbeg, "If you advance not, I'll force my way to you or death." Cf. "Si vous ne venez pas à moi, rien ne me peut empêcher d'aller à vous ou à la mort" (La Roche, p. 150).

⁷² It is not clear whether Whincop drew on the original French, the translation of 1690, or the translation of 1721. The translation of 1721 seems most probable. Whincop calls his hero Scanderbeg, the form in which his name appears in 1721. The French and the other translation calls him Scanderberg. In the play (p. 14) Scanderbeg tells Uranes that he sees "a party of our troops / Upon the scout." The 1721 translation (p. 286) reads, "Several Albanian horse, who had been out upon the scout," translating thus the French (p. 13), "Plusieurs Cavaliers albanais qui parcouroient les environs de Croye pour observer les Turcs." The 1690 translation (p. 12) reads, "Some Albanian troopers, who were riding about the city to observe the motion of the Turks." On the other hand, Whincop's sultan (p. 36) tells Aranit that he will be "forc'd to stoop / Beneath our pow'r"; the translation of 1721 (p. 337) renders the French "soumis à notre pouvoir" as "subject to our pleasure"; 1690 (p. 81) reads "subdu'd to our power." The question cannot be regarded as settled.

Scanderbeg, presented by "l'école libre Saint Joseph" in Poitiers in 1868, and of a tragedy, *Scanderberg*, by Guillaume Casimir Pertus (Paris, Roquette, 1870). There is less in England. Byron was probably inspired by some aspects of the Scanderbeg story in his description of Alp, the hero of *The Siege of Corinth*,⁷³ but after Byron the Albanian fades from view. In spite of Missolonghi and Sebastopol, the Turks and their oppressed subjects, past and present, seemed far away. The eclipse has continued to the present day. I know of no recent literary work in which the story of Scanderbeg has been utilized. Writers no longer let their imagination stray toward that

Land of Albania, where Iskander rose,
Theme of the young and beacon of the wise,
And he, his namesake, whose oft-baffled foes
Shrunk from his deeds of chivalrous emprise.⁷⁴

Wayne University

⁷³ Lines 821-30. See Sir Edward Creasy, *History of the Ottoman Turks* (New York, 1877), p. 73.

⁷⁴ Byron, *Childe Harold*, II, xxxviii.

HERMAN MELVILLE IN SOVIET CRITICISM

JOHN C. FISKE

THE Soviet view of American literature has gone through several phases, following roughly the evolution of Soviet-American relations and governed to a large extent by the various ideological pronouncements that have affected literature in general in the Soviet Union. A brief survey of these controlling factors seems an appropriate introduction to this study.¹

Until 1929, Soviet criticism followed no well-defined standards. There were still several non-Marxist schools of literary thought. Marxian critics seem, in general, to have worked on a basic principle of economic determinism. After 1930 this base was upset and discredited by the theory of the "social command," which meant, broadly speaking, that a writer was not merely the product of his socio-economic environment, but rather the conscious servant of some group or of some ideological principle. This theory is in line with the increased emphasis on individual will and individual responsibility which spread over many fields of Soviet thought from that time on.

The idea of the "social command" paved the way for a new set of literary principles known and officially endorsed under the name of "socialist realism." These principles Soviet literati were to follow in their own creative work, and by them they were to judge the writings of others, past and present. "Socialist realism," which still has the monopoly of official approval, is a somewhat nebulous but basically optimistic literary philosophy. It demands that Soviet writers should picture man as he is becoming under the banner of socialism. They should not dwell on the outcasts, failures, and rascals of Soviet society, the "remnants of capitalism," in the manner of critical realists; rather they should seek to portray the "Soviet man," more nearly ideal than typical, overcoming all obstacles as a result of his social "liberation," which, in the official view, means his integration into Soviet society.

Obviously, socialist realism does not cover all aspects of literary endeavor. It did little to settle stylistic questions; and its application to non-Soviet literature left much room for controversy. The attitude

¹ This article is a result of research carried on at Harvard University on a fellowship from the Russian Research Center, to which the author wishes to make grateful acknowledgement.

toward American literature has been, in the last twenty years, considerably affected by history. In the early 1930s the flourishing left-wing school in American writing naturally drew much friendly attention in the Soviet Union; and American diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union led to a brief "era of good feeling," during which there were many translations of American authors, past and present.

This feeling had pretty well faded by 1939. Many American intellectuals had turned away from militant leftism, and diplomatic tension between the two countries was increasing. During the war years literary as well as diplomatic relations improved, and Soviet critics and scholars paid much friendly attention to American literature. But with the end of the war and the steady worsening of United States-Soviet relations, the Soviet view of American life and literature became increasingly hostile. The only American authors approved were those who attacked or exposed the weaknesses of American life in all its aspects. Today Soviet critics seem to be trying to prove that America not only is, but always has been, rotten to the core. And, as a parallel to the new and rigid insistence on positive promotion of the regime in Soviet literature, there is an apparent tendency, in Soviet appraisal of current American writing, to approve only such militant leftists as Howard Fast and Albert Maltz.

Among the dead only a very few American literary figures seem to have been canonized as "pre-Communist saints." Mark Twain is regarded with respect, especially for his anti-imperialistic tracts of the McKinley-Roosevelt era. Jack London's private brand of socialism apparently makes him generally acceptable. Harriet Beecher Stowe and Walt Whitman also remain among the prophets.

Herman Melville is a writer still unknown to most citizens of the Soviet Union. The great Melville revival in the United States, which received much of its impetus from England and has attracted the attention of scholars in France and Germany, seems to have evoked only the slightest interest among the Soviet intelligentsia. I have found only two passing mentions of Melville in Soviet periodical literature, and, of his works, only *Typee* has been translated into Russian. Considering the large body of discussion and translation of American literature in the Soviet Union, and considering further the rich mine for exploitation along Marxist lines which is offered by Melville's views of the society of his time, this neglect is somewhat surprising; and it might be supposed that I have set myself to plow a barren field. But there is, as a matter of fact, a small but interesting body of material by which one may judge the evolution of the Soviet attitude toward Melville.

The earliest Soviet critical study of Melville that I have discovered

appears in the *Literary Encyclopaedia*,² over the signature of A. Melshko. The opening biographical paragraph is an almost direct translation from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. There follows a sketch, along familiar Marxist lines, of America in the 1830s and 1840s. Melville is pictured as a member of the declining patriarchal petty bourgeois class; he expresses the philosophy of individualism, rejects the world around him, and, moving off into abstraction and fantasy, seeks to demonstrate "the irrationalism of social relationships." Six of his works are mentioned and briefly analyzed. Of these, Melshko appears to have read only *Moby-Dick*. His treatment of the others shows no evidence that he has done more than read the critical works in his own bibliography, with the probable addition of Van Wyck Brooks' *Emerson and Others*. *Typee* and *Omee* are called escapes from reality, while *White Jacket*, *Moby-Dick*, *Pierre*, and *The Confidence Man* are attempts to "comprehend surrounding actuality and contemporary social relationships." As in most Soviet criticism since 1930, there is little emphasis on style; but Melville is twice given credit for "poetic figures" and is described as writing with "energy and power." The bibliography, replete with misspellings, includes Weaver, Freeman, and Mumford, as well as the standard edition of Melville's works.

A briefer and more superficial article on Melville appears in the *Large Soviet Encyclopaedia*.³ The same works are cited, but *Moby-Dick* is passed off as a "fantastic work on the whaling industry," and Melville is said to be strongly affected by "decadent motives."

No work of Melville is included in the anthology, *The American Novella of the XIX Century*,⁴ edited by A. Startsev in 1946; but in the introduction he is included with Poe and Hawthorne in the "American Romantic School," which, says Startsev, "has not yet been sufficiently studied with regard to those peculiarities which distinguish it from the European" (p. 6). Both Hawthorne and Melville are seen as picturing life "in generalized forms, as if to demonstrate the unwillingness or inability of American literature to take up the art of analysis of social phenomena—the greatest achievement of the European school of novelists."

In 1947, the Soviet Academy of Sciences published the first volume of a *History of American Literature*,⁵ covering our literature up to

² "Melville, Herman," in *Literaturnaiia entsiklopediia* (Moscow, 1930-39), VII, 108-109.

³ "Melville, Herman," in *Bol'shaia sovetskaiia entsiklopediia*, XXXVIII, (Moscow, 1938), 734.

⁴ *Amerikanskaia novella XIX veka* (Moscow, 1946).

⁵ *Istoriia amerikanskoi literatury*, ed. A. A. Anikst and A. A. Elistratova (Moscow-Leningrad, 1947).

1861 in more detail than any other Russian work. Chief contributors were Startsev and Elistratova, familiar figures in the field; the section on Melville, Poe, and Hawthorne, entitled "Literature of American Romanticism," was written by T. E. Sil'man, the breadth of whose critical field is indicated by earlier articles on Schiller, Hamsun, Fallada, and Hemingway. The sixteen-page chapter on Melville is by far the longest and most thorough study of that author that has yet been made in the Soviet Union.

The brief conclusion of the section pictures all three "romantics" as rejecting "contemporary capitalist actuality" (p. 308), but makes a sharp distinction between Poe on the one hand and Hawthorne and Melville on the other. Poe is called thoroughly antidemocratic in his political views, and is quoted to the effect that America is "the most hateful and unbearable despotism," inimical to art and beauty. But Hawthorne and Melville are "both radical democrats," though not associated with a specific political party. This appraisal seems fair enough, as far as it goes, for Poe and Melville—Melville even went so far as to point out to Hawthorne his "ruthless democracy"⁶—but for Hawthorne the suit scarcely seems to fit, especially when Sil'man adds that both Hawthorne and Melville were inclined toward Rousseauism and "found support in the Utopian socialism of their times." Sil'man goes on, however, to point out that all three men, lacking any positive social ideal, retreated into an individualism which was akin to nihilism. Even their Utopias, such as Brook Farm and "Serenia," they see through intensely individualistic eyes. Their heroes are solitary figures like Ahab or Roderick Usher or misfits like Hester Prynne. In general the "American Romantics" are found to be more bitter and pessimistic than the European. Sil'man finds cause for this in their later arrival on the scene, in an epoch and a nation where capitalism was making its greatest strides and presenting its sharpest contradictions.

The chapter on Melville himself opens with a biographical account which seems accurate enough—and not unnaturally so, since it was taken almost wholesale from the introduction to Thorp's selections.⁷ Since there is no bibliography in the volume, I have made some effort to derive sources from internal evidence, which shows that several American critics, but most notably Thorp, have been freely used. The only notable factual error appears in the first paragraph, where Sil'man states that Melville's mother was of Danish origin, a mistake perhaps

⁶ Herman Melville's letter to Hawthorne, June 1851, in Willard Thorp, *Herman Melville* (New York, 1938), p. 390.

⁷ Willard Thorp, *op. cit.*, pp. xii-cxxix.

stemming from the fact that the Russian word for "Dane" (fem.) is *Datchanka*.

In two paragraphs of general appraisal which follow the biography, Sil'man borrows extensively from Thorp, especially from that section of Thorp's introduction entitled "Melville's Social Ideas."⁸ But by selection and concentration he manages a considerable shift of emphasis, so that at the end of the passage Melville has been made to appear far more socially conscious and "ruthlessly democratic" than even Sil'man's own conclusion paints him.

In the course of the introductory paragraphs Sil'man has mentioned all of Melville's fictional works from *Typee* to *Timoleon* and *Billy Budd*. He now proceeds with an analysis of eight of them. *Typee* is treated at some length; but the fact that every quotation or reference to the original could have been drawn from Thorp's selections is a fairly good indication that he has never read the book. His interpretations are more original. He follows Freeman and Lawrence in making Melville a disciple of Rousseau, ignoring Thorp's denial.⁹ Melville is a Rousseauist, says Sil'man, because he considers important "not the social conditions as such, so much as the moral aspect of the people, deriving from their social development" (p. 294). Stressing Melville's delight in "this contemporary Eden," he points out the Typees' "brotherly feeling for each other, regardless of differences in material possessions." As a good Marxist, Sil'man is no doubt pleased to note the strong impression made upon the author by the combined labor of the natives in building a new house. The absence of theft and

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. xcvi-cxix. The extent to which Sil'man draws from Thorp may be gathered from the following parallel quotations:

THORP

"... he measures against their glorious American standards the attainment of the naked Polynesians ... he returned to the American of 1845 to record what he had observed." Pp. xcvi-xcviii.

"Every serious book or article which Melville wrote is a variation on the social theme." Page xcvi.

"... Melville's passion for social justice and his hatred of all the tyrannies by which man enslaves and brutalizes his fellows." Page c.

"... the radical nature of his democracy ... " Page ci.

SIL'MAN

"Unintentionally he compared the American civilization of 1845 with the society of naked Polynesians and found that in many respects the latter were happier." Page 293.

"The majority of his work was dictated by an interest in social problems." Page 293.

"He was moved by injustice and tyranny and dreamt of equality among men and social justice ... " Page 293.

"... His radical-democratic views ... " Page 293.

⁹ Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. cii. Thorp here specifically cites Freeman's and Lawrence's views.

murder, the mildness of Melville's attitude toward cannibalism, the explanation for the Typees' enmity toward "civilized" nations, all are touched upon without special coloration.

The discussion of *Omoo*, of about the same length (two pages) as that of *Typee*, contains fairly definite evidence that the critic has actually read the book. Sil'man points out that, although the inhabitants of Tahiti are, for the author, objects of satire, the major blows are reserved for the representatives of civilization among those people. Here he quotes at length the sermon of the English missionary,¹⁰ a passage not in Thorp's selections or, to the best of my knowledge, in any other major work on Melville.

Mardi, the next book discussed by the critic, is treated with great favor and considerable detail, although, in quotations and references, Sil'man has in no case gone beyond Thorp's selections. He states that the book "bore witness to the author's greater ripeness of ideas," and that it is "an open sociopolitical tract, done in the form of a romantic allegory" (p. 297). He ignores entirely the theme of the search for Yillah and concentrates on the sociopolitical satire. Although such an approach is natural enough for a Marxist, it can also be explained by the fact that the "Yillah" theme scarcely appears in Thorp's selections. Sil'man finds that Melville "uses the conventional scheme of a journey to express a number of ideas about democracy, to criticize the new plutocracy of England and America and the imperialistic tendencies of the English bourgeoisie, to stigmatize slavery, to warn against wars" (p. 297). To support this statement he quotes the conversation with the old reaper who works for the benefit of Lord Primo, refers to the revolutionary crowd (who, he explains, represent the Chartists) crying for bread, and, summarizing Melville's picture of "Vivenza," notes his condemnation of slavery, with the remark that nevertheless "the prospect of bloody civil war frightens him somewhat." He concludes with a picture of "Serenia," observing that in this Utopia there are neither priests nor kings.

For a moment the critic turns from fiction to Melville's articles on Hawthorne. In phrases strongly suggesting certain passages of today's Soviet criticism of its own literature, he states that Melville welcomed in Hawthorne a purely American, native genius as something of a novelty in American literature, "which had been guilty of imitation and uncritical reverence for all foreign (especially English) models" (p. 298). As an example of Melville's own ideas on the future of American literature Sil'man quotes, with rather characteristic freedom, a sentence from "Hawthorne and His Mosses." The quotation reads: "An Amer-

¹⁰ Melville, *Works* (London, 1922), II, 204-205. In the original the sermon is reported in a sort of Pidgin which Sil'man makes no attempt to reproduce.

ican is called to carry his republicanism not only into life, but into literature."¹¹ With the substitution of two words, this sentence would be an excellent summary of present Soviet literary dicta.

Despite its satire, Sil'man considers *Mardi* to be generally optimistic in tone. This optimism he accounts for by remarking that in 1848 "the author was full of hopes which for him were associated with the European revolution" (p. 298). The failure of this revolution was, according to Sil'man, the cause of his "disenchantment" by the time he wrote *Moby-Dick*, a disenchantment that continued for the rest of his life. This rather startling assertion is scarcely an auspicious introduction to a study of Melville's greatest novel; but fortunately Sil'man makes no further effort to drive his point home.

The critic finds that the originality of *Moby-Dick* resides in "the idea of combining a story of dark and dangerous adventures with the functions of a problem novel" (p. 298). He notes that here again is Melville's familiar pattern of a journey, and sees in the removal from civilization "a 'nautical' parallel for the wild landscapes among which are enacted the mysteries of Dante, Milton, and Byron." Continuing his search for precedents and parallels, Sil'man mentions "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" and "The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym." "But," he adds, "in Melville's novel there is produced something so majestic, so far surpassing in its scale any minor local-color realism that the break from the everyday world can be taken for granted" (p. 299).

Here, at last, is a departure from purely Marxist criticism; here is a hint of the critic's sincere enthusiasm for the book; and at this point Sil'man makes his first attempt to penetrate the symbolism of Herman Melville. He calls the book "a whale-fighting mystery." Seeking to isolate the symbolic elements, he finds a contradiction in the fact that the author is "emphatically naturalistic in everything that concerns the material side of the affair, and at the same time generalized and symbolic in his conclusions." He recognizes two possible interpretations of the book, the realistic and the abstract. He then attempts to follow the development of the symbolism through to "the last acts of the tragedy," first acknowledging the multiplicity of interpretations in American critical literature and limiting himself to the most general analysis of the idea of the book.

Sil'man begins by quoting two of the "Extracts" which appear at the beginning of *Moby-Dick*: "'And God created great whales.'—Genesis; 'Now the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up

¹¹ The original, appearing in Thorp, *op. cit.*, pp. 335-336, reads: "But what sort of belief is this for an American, a man who is bound to carry republican progressiveness into Literature as well as into Life?"

Jonah.'—Jonah."¹² From such biblical quotations, according to the critic, Melville draws his interpretation of the whale as symbol of the wrath of God, further developing the symbol to include all the evil and injustice in the world, which is stronger than man. Thus Ahab is a "theomachist, setting himself up against a tyrannical first cause, like ancient Prometheus or the heroes of Byron's dramas" (p. 300). Sil'man later asserts the relation to Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Byron's *Manfred* and *Cain*, stating that in *Moby-Dick*, as in the works of the English poets, "there sounds the theme of revolution, cast down into the abyss by the 'godly' order" (p. 301). The philosophy of *Moby-Dick* is, as Sil'man sees it, directly opposed to that expressed in Father Mapple's sermon. Father Mapple's Jonah "feels that his dreadful punishment is just" (p. 302).¹³ But Ahab will not thus humble his pride before "blind force." He is "an avenger, a Titan," and, a few lines later, he is "the antipodes of the Biblical Jonah and the continuer of the action of Prometheus, Satan and Lucifer . . . He is the hero of the voyage and the hero of the myth." If one accepts this thesis, then Melville, like Ahab his hero, is a revolutionary against the "old, 'godly' order," which is in turn identified with "blind force." Along with Prometheus, Satan, and Lucifer—and the militant atheists of the Soviet regime—he defies the avenging God and his injustice.

The rest of the analysis of *Moby-Dick* is supplementary to this central theme. Ahab's external differences from the literary ancestors that have been assigned to him—"his austerity, his unbending will, his fanaticism"—are part of the "puritan spirit of New England" (p. 301). The ship, with its variegated crew, is called a microcosm, a Noah's Ark, fitted to the generalized allegory of the book. (There is, by the way, no apparent effort to make the rather difficult distinction between "symbol" and "allegory.") Ishmael, as well as Ahab, is called the hero of the book, and is said to be a Byronic misanthrope, though "without the aristocracy traditional for a Byronic hero" (p. 303). Ishmael's relationship to Queequeg receives considerable space as a reiteration of the social views expressed in *Typee*. In general, *Moby-Dick* receives far more extensive treatment than any of Melville's other works. Seven of the sixteen pages of the article are devoted to this one book.

Melville's work after *Moby-Dick* is characterized by Sil'man as either "purely adventurous" or "of a more subtly psychological, esoteric character" (p. 305). The hero of *Pierre* is "somewhat in the order of a modern Hamlet," whose ideals are unfitted for a world where the dark principle of evil is bound to triumph. *Benito Cereno* is described in considerable detail, though the critic notes that Melville was basically

¹² Melville, *Moby Dick*, ed. Willard Thorp (New York, 1947), p. xxiv.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

interested "not in the political aspect of the mutiny, but on the tragic contradiction between actuality and the false appearance of what is presented to the eye" (p. 306). *Bartleby the Scrivener* is considered to be the portrait of a little man caught in the toils of futile bourgeois society. No mention is made of its striking resemblance to certain works of Gogol and Dostoevsky. Finally, *Billy Budd* is pictured as merely another example of the triumph of injustice; and on this note the article ends, with the remark that in his uncompromising pessimism Melville is close to Poe, "for all the disparity of the sociopolitical orientation of the two authors" (p. 307).

Despite its own sociopolitical orientation, this article is much more interesting—and at certain points more perceptive—than the general run of recent Soviet criticism. Certainly Sil'man has shown considerable ingenuity in bringing Ahab—and Prometheus—within the Marxian orbit. But he has also made a great effort to place Melville in a broad literary and philosophical as well as socio-economic background. He could have drawn his references to Dante, Milton, Shelley, and perhaps Coleridge from American critical sources; the emphasis on Poe and Byron seems distinctly in the European tradition. He has also been careful, in his introductory and biographical paragraphs, to take note of Melville's apparent interest in Hegel, Schlegel, Kant, and Schopenhauer, as well as his enthusiasm for Hawthorne and his acquaintance with Bryant and Irving. It is rather surprising, but not, so far as I can see, significant that Shakespeare is almost entirely neglected in this analysis.

Beyond an announcement of publication in May 1947,¹⁴ there was apparently no mention in Soviet periodicals of the *History of American Literature* until February 1948, at which time A. Tarasenkova published an article entitled "Cosmopolites in Literary Scholarship."¹⁵ Among other "cosmopolitan" outcroppings, the *History* comes in for its share of attack. Startsev, the chief contributor and apparently the actual editor, is accused of "exaggerating the significance of American literature," of "blunting the sharpest class contradictions which characterize it." There is no specific mention of the Melville article; the venom is directed chiefly at Poe and at Sil'man's interpretation of Poe. Sil'man's analysis is an "apology for decadence, for that very *weltschmerz* of which Comrade Stalin spoke so harshly." The unfortunate had even been so unwise as to quote Dostoevsky, who was in turn in the midst of being officially damned.

It seems, in fact, that the editors had been caught in the general purge

¹⁴ *Sovetskaiia kniga*, Moscow, No. 5, 1947, p. 125.

¹⁵ A. Tarasenkova, "Kosmopolity ot literaturovedeniia," *Novyi Mir*, Moscow, No. 2, 1948, pp. 124-137. Quotations in this paragraph are from pp. 131-132.

of "cosmopolites" who appear, during the last five years, to have swarmed as thickly in the Soviet Union as potato bugs in eastern Germany. The poor editors are damned not only for the nature of their interpretations, but even, apparently, for having bothered to interpret at all. "In the general line of the history of culture," says Tarasenkov (p. 137), "the work of Gorky and Mayakovsky, of Aleksei Tolstoy, Sholokhov and Fadeev means more, much more, than various American Melvilles and Irvings, Smiths and Emersons to whom so much attention is devoted in this same *History of American Literature*."

Iowa State College

DIDEROT'S OWN MISS SARA SAMPSON

ROBERT R. HEITNER

SCHOLARS familiar with the details of Lessing's enthusiasm for Diderot's theories concerning the middle-class drama and for his serious comedy, *Le Père de famille*, have always had to conclude regretfully that Diderot did not reciprocate with any tangible interest in Lessing. There have been some attempts to identify Diderot as the author of an anonymous article in the *Journal Etranger* of December 1761, which favorably reviewed Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson*, but the assumption has never had general credence.¹ Yet there is now proof from another quarter that, even if Diderot was unaware of Lessing's more masterly productions, he was at least actively interested over a period of years in this very play, *Miss Sara Sampson*. He was, in fact, planning to return the compliment which Lessing had paid him (whether Diderot knew of the compliment or not) in presenting *Das Theater des Herrn Diderot* to the German public in 1760. It was in connection with this plan that Diderot acquired his personal translation of *Miss Sara*, which until now has lain in obscurity.²

In the early 1760s, not long after the appearance of Lessing's *Theater* translation (although I do not want to stress this coincidence overmuch), Diderot had in mind to publish a number of bourgeois tragedies. His purpose, aside from that of acquainting the French with some foreign examples of the new domestic style in drama, was to point out that a bourgeois tragedy had been written in French already and that this could be done again with profit. He listed the titles of the plays in a little essay³ which he meant to put as a preface to his publication: *Sylvie* by Landois,⁴ *The London Merchant* by Lillo, *The Gamester* by Moore, and *Miss Sara Sampson*. At one time he also contemplated adding

¹ See F. O. Nolte, "The Authorship of a Review of Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson*," *PMLA*, XLIII (1928), 220-236, in which the review is ascribed to one of the editors of the *Journal*, Suard or Arnaud.

² I wish to acknowledge with gratitude my indebtedness to Professor Herbert Dieckmann of Harvard University, who not only entrusted me with the handling of the manuscript discussed in this article but also materially assisted me with the research necessary for its interpretation.

³ *Œuvres complètes de Diderot*, ed. J. Assézat et Maurice Tourneux (Paris, 1875-77), VIII, 439-442.

⁴ In the above-mentioned preface Diderot did not name *Sylvie* or Landois, but described the play in such a way that its identity is unambiguous.

Lillo's *Fatal Curiosity* to the collection.⁵ Since the project was not realized, it has been largely overlooked by modern scholars. Consequently, the one definite proof that Diderot had regard for Lessing has never received the attention it deserves. Lately, however, the matter has been unexpectedly highlighted by the discovery of a complete French translation of *Miss Sara Sampson* among the previously uncatalogued manuscripts of Diderot known as the Fonds Vandeul.⁶

The glowing first hope which such a find always inspires—that we have here a genuine work of Diderot's own hand—receives fleeting support from Diderot himself. In the preface which was supposed to have headed the publication, he spoke as though he personally had translated all of the plays: "Ces pièces m'ont fait plaisir, j'espère qu'elles feront plaisir à d'autres, et je les donne. L'une a été écrite en français, *Le Marchand de Londres* et *Le Joueur* en anglais, et *Miss Sara Sampson* en allemand. Il y a si peu de mérite à avoir traduit ces ouvrages, que je n'en exige aucune reconnaissance."⁷ But, unfortunately, all that Diderot's statement indicates is that the preface must have been written before the publishing project was very well thought through.⁸ It is true that he had translated *The Gamester* in 1760. He would also have been quite capable of translating *The London Merchant*, although the work had already been done by Pierre Clément in 1748.⁹ He may have been sanguine enough to believe that he would translate *Miss Sara Sampson* as well. Probably his ignorance of German seemed to him no insuperable obstacle, since learning the language would have been a fairly easy and substantially rewarding task.

Nevertheless, Diderot did not accomplish what according to the preface he had intended. When he finally obtained a translation of *Miss Sara*, it was not his own work after all. Some passages in the letters to Mlle Volland tell the story of how he came into possession of his *Miss*

⁵ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, ed. André Babelon (Paris, 1930), II, 126, letter of Aug. 15, 1762.

⁶ These manuscripts were brought to the United States in 1948 by Dr. Herbert Dieckmann.

⁷ *Œuvres*, VIII, 442; italics mine.

⁸ Maurice Tourneux, while cataloguing Diderot's manuscripts in Russia, found the words "en 55" on the first page of a copy of the preface and concluded that the date of the preface was therefore 1755, whereas Assézat had believed 1762 to be correct. See Maurice Tourneux, "Les Manuscrits de Diderot conservés en Russie" (catalogue), *Archives des Missions scientifiques et littéraires*, série 3, XII, 447-448. Nevertheless, the preface cannot have been written as early as 1755, since that was the same year in which *Miss Sara* was published. Furthermore, Diderot also mentioned the German drama, "Clémentine"—by which he must have meant Wieland's *Klementine von Porretta*, which was not written until 1760. In my opinion, late 1760 or 1761 would be the most probable dates for the preface.

⁹ Clarence Dietz Brenner, *A Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language 1700-1789* (Berkeley, 1947), p. 48, item 4842.

Sara Sampson. The first of these is in the letter of September 28, 1761: "J'ai enfin cette tragédie allemande, et l'agréable, c'est que je ne la tiens pas de M. de Montigni [*sic*]." ¹⁰ The juxtaposition of "German tragedy" and "Montigni" makes it evident that the reference here is to *Miss Sara Sampson*; for Jean-Charles-Philibert Trudaine de Montigny, councillor of state but also author and *bel esprit*, had made the first translation into French of *Miss Sara Sampson*, by the year 1761 at the latest. Although it remained in manuscript form, Montigny's translation was possibly played in Paris, ¹¹ and was certainly played in 1764 at the private theater of the Duc d'Ayen at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. ¹² Excerpts from it were extensively quoted in the review of the play in the *Journal Etranger* of December 1761, to which I have alluded above. This review does not mention Montigny by name, but its acknowledgement points unequivocally to him: "La traduction sur laquelle nous avons fait cet extrait, est l'ouvrage d'un homme qui donne à la culture des Sciences, des Lettres, et des Arts (car il sacrifie au cœur entier des Muses) tous les intervalles que lui laissent ses importantes occupations." ¹³

Evidently Diderot had requested Trudaine de Montigny to lend him the manuscript translation but had not received it. Why would Diderot say otherwise that it was "agreeable" to him to have received the play from another source? He went on to explain to Mlle Volland how he did succeed in obtaining the German tragedy: "Je reçois de temps en temps la visite de deux petits Allemands; ce sont deux enfants tout à fait aimables et bien élevés. Je leur ai témoigné l'envie de connaître cet ouvrage, et ils me l'ont traduit en deux ou trois jours; je ne sais encore ce que c'est." ¹⁴ This makes it clear that Diderot did not do the translation himself. In fact, there is no evidence that he ever learned to read German.

In a later letter, ¹⁵ Diderot identified these two young men as "Nicolai" ¹⁶ and "de la Fermière." They were either sufficiently enthusiastic

¹⁰ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, II, 40.

¹¹ Friedrich Nicolai in the 256. *Literaturbrief* reported that *Miss Sara* would be performed in the winter of the year 1762 at the *Théâtre Français*. This cannot be definitely confirmed.

¹² *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique* par Grimm, Diderot, Raynal, Meister, et al., ed. Maurice Tournoux (Paris, 1878), VI, 140-141. Here also a rather vague statement points to the possibility of a performance of *Miss Sara* in Paris: "M. Trudaine de Montigny, intendant des finances, a traduit cette pièce, qui a eu un grand succès à Paris [*italics mine*], quoique le traducteur ne l'ait communiquée qu'en manuscrit, et n'ait pas voulu qu'elle fût imprimée."

¹³ Page 41.

¹⁴ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, II, 40; *italics mine*.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 62, Oct. 25, 1761.

¹⁶ This Nicolai, whose connections are unknown, should not be confused with Lessing's publisher-friend, Friedrich Nicolai.

about Lessing's play to have a copy of it in their baggage—for they were travelers, living in an inn, to which they once invited Diderot for dinner—or they procured one to please him. Then they translated it for him, at his express desire. On October 12, 1761, Diderot wrote to Mlle Volland that he had seen the translation, was satisfied with it, and would send it to her: "Je n'ai rien à faire à la tragédie qu'ils m'ont traduite; elle vous plaira comme elle est . . ."¹⁷ That the two young Germans had sent their manuscripts to him by mail is implied in a letter dated October 25, 1761, after two weeks had passed and he still had not transmitted the translation to Mlle Volland. He was afraid that she would have to pay an exorbitant postal duty, as he had been made to.¹⁸ One wonders whether he actually did send the manuscript and if it arrived safely, because this is the last mention of it, the last time one can say with certainty that it was in Diderot's possession. From the passages of these letters one can determine this much—that there was a translation of *Miss Sara Sampson* commissioned and examined by Diderot, a special translation, not the one by Trudaine de Montigny and not identical with any of the other existing eighteenth-century translations of the German play. But may one conclude that the manuscript translation in the Fonds Vandeul is the long-lost *Sara* commissioned by Diderot?

Trudaine's version, which was left in manuscript form by the author's wish and never printed in its entirety, would seem to furnish a likely alternative clue to the identity of the Fonds Vandeul manuscript. One cannot tell how it would have found its way into this collection, since as Diderot said he did *not* have the play from Trudaine de Montigny, but one cannot rule out the possibility that he received it at some later time. When, however, we examine the excerpts from Trudaine's translation in the *Journal Etranger*, we find that every single speech differs in an obvious way from the corresponding passages in the Vandeul manuscript. Thus Trudaine is eliminated as the possible author. There are several other translations of *Miss Sara Sampson* into French listed in C. D. Brenner's *A Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language 1700-1789*.¹⁹ One is by Baron Jacob Friedrich von Bielfeld (1716?-1770), which appeared in 1767 in *Progrès des Allemands dans les sciences*, Vol. II.²⁰ Bielfeld translated much of the play in résumé, but the speeches that he reproduced in full are not identical with the manuscript translation. Another translation was published in 1772 in the *Théâtre allemand*, Vol. I,²¹ the work of Georges-Adam

¹⁷ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, II, 53.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

¹⁹ Items 3765, 6561, 7499.

²⁰ Leyden, Sam et Jean Luchtman.

²¹ Paris, J. B. Costard.

Junker (1716-1805) and his collaborator Liébault (dates unknown). The French of Junker and Liébault is quite close to that of the Vandeul manuscript, but there are enough striking differences to indicate that the two translations are definitely not identical. The latest known French translation before 1789 is by Adrien-Chrétien Friedel (1753-1786) and his very helpful collaborator Nicolas de Bonneville (1760-1828), published in 1784 in the *Nouveau Théâtre allemand*, Vol. X.²² In contrast to the Junker-Liébault version, the French of this translation, a very model of polished style, bears absolutely no resemblance to the French of the Fonds Vandeul manuscript.

During the 1760s one other translation into French was made by, it is interesting to note, a prince of Braunschweig. Boie mentioned this work in a letter to Gleim from Flensburg on December 8, 1767: "Herr Lessing hat bei seiner Durchreise durch Braunschweig neulich das Vergnügen gehabt seine *Miss Sara* nach einer neuen französischen Uebersetzung des Prinzen Friedrich zu sehen; mit den darin gemachten Veränderungen aber soll er nicht allerdings zufrieden gewesen sein."²³ Erich Schmidt had a hasty glance at "eine von einem braunschweigischen Prinzen, offenbar Prinz August von Braunschweig-Oels, geschriebene Uebersetzung *Sara Sampson* sujet anglois tragédie bourgeoise (darin *Arabelle* personnage muet) . . ."²⁴ Undoubtedly these two references are to the same work, and the princely translator must have been Friedrich August, Duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg-Oels (1740-1805), who is not only remembered as a brilliant military technician but also as a friend of literature. The manuscript of this translator is presumably still in the Nachlaß der Herzogin Amalia zu Weimar (Großherzogliches Hausarchiv), where both Schmidt and Kinkel reported to it be quite unobtainable;²⁵ however, since Boie said that Lessing was displeased with the "changes" the prince had made and Schmidt saw that *Arabella* was transformed into a "personnage muet," it cannot be the same as the Fonds Vandeul manuscript, which is remarkably faithful to Lessing's original.

A process of elimination leaves little room for doubt that the Fonds Vandeul manuscript is indeed that translation commissioned by Diderot from the two young Germans. Moreover, in the manuscript itself there are textual evidences which support the assumption, directly and

²² At Paris. Friedel was "Professeur des Pages du Roi."

²³ Quoted by Jaro Pawel, "Boies ungedruckter Briefwechsel mit Gleim," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, XXVII (1895), 366.

²⁴ Erich Schmidt, *Lessing, Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften* (Berlin, 1884-92), II, 790.

²⁵ Hans Kinkel, *Lessings Dramen in Frankreich* (Darmstadt, 1908), p. 97, note 7.

indirectly. In fact, the manuscript may well be the very original which Nicolai and de la Ferrière sent to Diderot.

The paper is different from that of the rest of the volume in which the manuscript is included. The sheets, which look older, do not fit very neatly into the covers, and the ink is pale brown and faded, in contrast to the black ink of the rest of the manuscripts. The script, unlike that of the other precise, professional-looking manuscripts, is in cramped, uneven lines, a calligraphy clearly dissimilar to that of Roland Girbal or other known copyists employed by Diderot. If one looks at the first few pages and then at the last few, one perceives such a difference in the style of handwriting that one is tempted to conclude that two hands were at work. On closer inspection, however, a steady change is observable which makes such a conclusion less tenable. The spelling is somewhat archaic; the combinations "ui" and "oi" are uniformly "uy," "oy." All these details point to an early date and unprofessional composition. Either Nicolai or de la Ferrière could well have prepared this manuscript.

Furthermore, the translation which the manuscript sets forth was made from the first edition of Lessing's play, the edition of 1755. This is the only one, of course, which would have been available to the two Germans in 1761, for the second edition was not published until 1772. The 1755 edition was a double one, known as "a" and "c," but identical in its two sections except for minor variations in spelling.²⁶ The 1772 edition shows some small changes in wording, which are valuable for determining from which edition the Fonds Vandeul translation was made. For example, the father of Sara is called "Sir Sampson" throughout in 1755—and in the Vandeul manuscript—while in 1772 this has been changed to the idiomatic "Sir William Sampson." Again, a speech left out in 1772 but included in 1755 occurs in our translation (Marwood, II, 3).²⁷

A striking feature of the manuscript are the copious emendations which are scattered interlinearly and marginally through the main text. They are in dark brown ink and show a much more personal, less legible handwriting. Although they are principally written in one consistent hand, there are also several in an unmistakable second hand. The emendations are most numerous in the first two acts, but are continued

²⁶ G. E. Lessings sämtliche Schriften, ed. Karl Lachmann, 3te aufs neue durchgesehene und vermehrte Auflage besorgt durch Franz Muncker (Stuttgart, Leipzig, Berlin, 1886-1924), II, 265-362.

²⁷ "Mein Herz bebet vor Freuden, Sie wieder zu sehen, Sie wieder an meine Brust zu drücken." This is omitted in the 1772 edition but is translated in the Vandeul manuscript as "Mon cœur est tout engoué du plaisir de vous revoir, de vous serrer dans mes bras."

less densely all the way to the end. Between the various scenes, which follow upon each other with practically no intervening space on the manuscript, the emendator drew curving end designs, as if to indicate to a subsequent copyist (or printer) that a more suitable interval should separate the scenes. On the first page, also in dark ink, is the notation: "Copiée en Fevrier 1783." Taken at face value, these words would mean that a new copy, whatever has since then become of it, was indeed made. The emendations themselves, however, may have been written much earlier than 1783.

The principal emendator and the "second hand" were not very much concerned with improving the style of the translation. Rather, they sought to bring the wording as near as possible to the German text. They must have worked with a copy of the 1772 edition of *Miss Sara*. This is demonstrated most clearly in a single passage, although there are other, lesser indications. In Act I, Scene 7, Mellefont says, in the 1755 edition, "das Frauenzimmer ist nicht ungeneigt," and the French translators render, "la personne n'a point de répugnance"; but the 1772 edition adds, "das Frauenzimmer, *die es mit betrifft*, ist nicht ungeneigt," and the emendator dutifully inserts, next to "la personne," the words, "dont il s'agit." However, most of the changes made by the emendator involve passages which are identical in both the 1755 and 1772 editions. There are three places in the first act where the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 appear above the text. A comparison of the German original with these passages reveals that the emendator was paying an all too scrupulous attention to the German wording; for the numbers refer to nothing more significant than the original position of the sentence elements in the German. Here and there, but only very occasionally, the emendator made a change not dictated by the German text. Presumably these few changes were intended to promote a better French style. He also drew lines around a number of whole speeches, rather vehement and passionate ones, probably to indicate that they were too violent for the prevailing taste of the French stage.

The emendations in themselves are not so interesting as the question of their author's identity. Obviously it was not Diderot himself who made them. He who was not sufficiently (if at all) acquainted with the German language to make the translation in the first place would hardly be the person to try to bring the translation word for word closer to the German text. Besides, he had written to Mlle Volland that the translation pleased him as it was. Then who was the anonymous chief emendator? Diderot's friends, Grimm, Holbach, and Meister, would all have been qualified linguistically, but there is no similarity between speci-

mens of their handwriting and that of the chief emendator.²⁸ Diderot, however, had other German friends, namely de la Ferrière and Nicolai. Almost no information is available concerning the two men, but they were by no means mere temporary acquaintances who kindly prepared a translation for Diderot and then passed forever from his society. The duration of the friendship is confirmed by several references to Nicolai and de la Ferrière in letters sent between 1766 and 1768 to the sculptor, Falconet, in Russia. Falconet, a new arrival at the court of Catherine II, where he was commissioned to make a statue of Peter the Great, was urged by Diderot to make contact with the young Germans. In a letter dated September 6, 1768, Diderot wrote:

je n'ai jamais rien vu qui m'ait autant surpris, autant touché que l'amitié de M. de la Ferrière et de M. Nicolai. Pas la moindre prétention personnelle. L'un n'interrompt jamais l'autre; bien mieux encore, pressé de se recommander ou de se faire valoir à son désavantage. Il est certain que ce sont d'honnêtes gens, d'un goût et d'une délicatesse de sentiment peu commune. Je ne sais lequel j'aurais aimé le plus. M. de la Ferrière a du jugement, de la raison, de la fermeté. M. de Nicolai, lui, a reçu de la sensibilité et de la douceur. Ils ont tous deux de l'urbanité et des connaissances.²⁹

Apparently the two Germans were attached in some way to the Russian court from 1766 to 1768, at least, and quite possibly were still there when Diderot arrived in 1773. It may be that Diderot saw them again, and that they expressed a desire to review the translation which they had once made for him, and that the chief emendator was one of the two Germans, with the other adding a few notes. Naturally, the handwriting of the emendations would be different from that of the text—the latter studied and impersonal, to promote general legibility, the former put down in haste and with no thought for style. To be sure, this can be no more than a conjecture, but the fact that the emendator used a copy of the 1772 edition fits in well with the chronology.

Here, then, is a virtually unknown sidelight on Franco-German literary relationships in the eighteenth century which gains importance from the two great figures, Lessing and Diderot, who are involved in it.³⁰ We are able to examine the private version of *Miss Sara Sampson*

²⁸ Professor Dieckmann has courteously supplied me with this information.

²⁹ *Œuvres*, XVIII, 282.

³⁰ Lessing himself could hardly have been unaware of Diderot's publishing project. Surely he read with pleasure in *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, edited by his friend, Friedrich Nicolai, this "Auszug eines Schreibens aus Paris" (I, 308-309): "Herr Lessings *Miss Sarah Sampson* ist am Ende des Jahres 1764 zu St. Germain, bey dem Herzoge von Noailles, vor dem Herzoge von Choiseul, und den vornehmsten Herren und Damen vom Hofe mit dem größten Beyfalle aufgeführt worden. Herr Trüdame [*sic*] von Montigny hatte darinn einige kleine Veränderungen gemacht; allein Herr Diderot wird das Stück ganz herausgeben, und zwar mit dem englischen *Spieler* und dem *Kaufmann zu London*. Vermuthlich wird er auch Anmerkungen über die Natur dieser drey Stücke hinzu thun."

which Diderot once owned, and we are reminded again of the significant part which German nationals played in Diderot's literary circle.

A few points regarding the "projet de préface" which was supposed to head the translations planned by Diderot remain to be discussed. Both Assézat and Tourneux, on the strength of the manuscripts perused by them, state that it was addressed to Trudaine de Montigny. The manuscript with which Assézat worked had only the words "Envoyé à M. Tru . . ." inscribed on it;³¹ but in his catalogue of the Russian manuscripts Tourneux identifies the preface as one sent to "M. Trudaine"; presumably the manuscript he saw had the name more fully inscribed.³² No mention of Trudaine, however, appears on the manuscript copy of the preface in the Fonds Vandeul. It is not perfectly clear why the preface should have been addressed to Trudaine, in view of Diderot's feelings towards him as suggested in the letter to Mlle Volland. Of course, the preface was probably composed many months previously, when Diderot still looked upon Trudaine with favor as a powerful friend of the middle-class drama.

Naigeon, while preparing his edition of Diderot's collected works, spoke of the preface in a letter to M. and Mme de Vandeul dated August 3, 1786:

J'avais le projet de préface que vous avez envoyé, et j'en ai même parlé dans l'ouvrage en question.³³ Il y a beaucoup de vrai dans ce papier, et on peut y répondre beaucoup de choses également vraies . . . M. Diderot avait eu dessein de faire réimprimer les drames anglais et allemands, les premiers traduits par Clément. Les derniers traduits par M. de Trudaine, et de mettre à la tête cette petite préface qu'il n'a pas revue, et dans laquelle il est resté plusieurs choses obscures et des répétitions fréquentes des mêmes mots, qu'il aurait sûrement retouchés si son projet eût eu lieu.³⁴

These remarks are a just criticism of the quality of the unfinished preface,³⁵ but they do not reveal any precise knowledge of the circumstances of the proposed publication. Certainly the translation of one of the English tragedies, *The Gamester*, was not to be by Clément, since

³¹ Maurice Tourneux, "Les Manuscrits de Diderot conservés en Russie," p. 447.

³² Diderot, *Oeuvres*, VIII, 439.

³³ Naigeon refers here to his *Mémoires historiques et philosophiques sur la vie et les ouvrages de Diderot* (Paris, 1821). But his memory plays him false. There is no mention of the preface in this work.

³⁴ Quoted by J. Massiet du Biest, "Lettres inédites de Naigeon à M. et Mme de Vandeul (1786-1787)," *Bulletin de la société historique et archéologique de Langres*, XII (1948), 1-12.

³⁵ The gist of Diderot's argument in the preface, which is that the French originated the bourgeois style and then were misled to abandon it, is founded on a chronological error, as pointed out by L. M. Price, "George Barnwell Abroad," *Comparative Literature*, II (1950), 134. *Sylvie*, which Diderot took to be the first bourgeois tragedy, was written in 1742, whereas Lillo had written *The London Merchant* a whole decade earlier, in 1731, and *The Fatal Curiosity* in 1737.

Diderot himself had translated it. As for the German play (there was only one, not two or more, as intimated by Naigeon), Diderot may have at first expected to use Trudaine's translation; but, as we have seen, he acquired a version from the two young Germans.

It is very likely that Diderot wrote his preface at the same time or shortly after he translated *The Gamester* in 1760. He kept the publishing project in mind then for two years, during which his somewhat vague plans were subject to change, and then gave it up after 1762.³⁶ Quite possibly the Abbé de Loirelle's unexpected publication of a *Joueur* in 1762 served to discourage Diderot, in spite of the fact that he had confidently written to Mlle Volland that this "mauvaise traduction du *Joueur* . . . loin de me nuire, fait au contraire désirer la mienne . . ."³⁷

Washington University

³⁶ Talk concerning the project was still going on in 1765, however. See note 30 above.

³⁷ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, II, 126, letter of Aug. 15, 1762. Diderot's own version of *The Gamester* was not published until 1819.

THE CHICAGO CRITICS

W. K. WIMSATT, JR.

I challenge all the world, to show one good epic, elegiac or lyric poem . . . ; one eclogue, pastoral, or anything like the ancients. — Jonathan Smedley, *Gulliveriana* (1728).

BACK in the mid-1930s Professor R. S. Crane of Chicago had a conversion, from straight, neutral history of literature and ideas to literary criticism. His essay, "History versus Criticism in the University Study of Literature," in the *English Journal*, October 1935, was for its date a revolutionary document, a signal victory for criticism. It drew a line between history and criticism with convincing clarity, though perhaps so severely as to have helped raise some later needless embarrassment between academic critics and their colleagues.¹ Mr. Crane received the handsome compliments of a poet and critic, Mr. John Crowe Ransom, in his essay entitled "Criticism, Inc.," which appeared two years later in the *Virginia Quarterly Review*.² "If criticism should get a hearing in the universities," said Mr. Ransom, "the credit would probably belong to Professor Ronald S. Crane . . . more than to any other man. He is the first of the great professors to have advocated it as a major policy for departments of English."

Yet Mr. Crane was in 1935 a pioneer advocate of criticism only with respect to his eminence inside an American university. The critical study of literature had been violently incited during the 1920s and early 1930s in the works of I. A. Richards and at least strongly encouraged by other writers. The eruption of critical volumes and school texts by Tate, Ransom, Brooks and Warren, Winters, and others, which began in America almost immediately after Mr. Crane's essay, and the busy debate about university teaching of literature which went on in the quarterlies were events which had not come to a head overnight. With respect to the whole horizon of literary study, Mr. Crane's action of 1935 was not a novelty. Critics were already springing up here and there in force. It was a question of some strategic importance

¹ The big difference between Mr. Crane and Professor Lowes, whose MLA presidential address of 1933 in favor of criticism Mr. Crane cited, was that Mr. Crane believed a large part of literary historical studies not only noncritical but not even ancillary to criticism (*English Journal*, XXIV, 645, 660).

² Autumn 1937. The essay was reprinted in Mr. Ransom's important volume of criticism, *The World's Body* (1938).

whether Mr. Crane would try to take command, as indeed Mr. Ransom seemed to invite.

In a set of three brief essays—two exercises in practical criticism by younger colleagues, Professors Maclean and Olson, and an introductory note by Mr. Crane himself, published in the *Kansas City University Review*, Winter 1942—the Chicago critics made, I believe, their first public revelation of how sweeping were to be not only their own claims but their disapproval of the trend in criticism promoted by “such men as . . . Eliot . . . Richards . . . Brooks . . . Ransom, and . . . Tate.” By the year 1944 the movement had attracted one outside ally in Professor Hoyt Trowbridge, who voiced his enthusiastic approval in an essay published in the *Sewanee Review*.³ Other expressions by the Chicago school followed during the 1940s, especially under Mr. Crane's editorship, in *Modern Philology*. Now, with the publication by the University of Chicago Press of the weighty *Critics and Criticism Ancient and Modern*,⁴ containing fourteen previously published essays, six new ones, and an Introduction by Mr. Crane, the record is solidly and reiteratively established.

The essays which compose this Chicago monument divide into three main sections: first, the assaults on other contemporary critics (Crane on Richards and Brooks, Olson on Empson and R. P. Warren, and Professor William Keast on Heilman); second, the history of critical systems (Professor Richard McKeon's account of Aristotle on imitation and language and of the variously transformed rhetoric and poetics of the Middle Ages, Olson on the system of Longinus, Professor Bernard Weinberg on the deviations of Renaissance Aristotelianism, Crane, Maclean, and Keast on the final decay of Aristotelian principles during the eighteenth century); third, exposition and instances of correct neo-Aristotelian poetics (McKeon on the philosophic bases, Olson on general poetics and symbolism, Maclean on *Lear*, Crane on *Tom Jones*).

I believe that several of the historical pieces, notably the two by Mr. Weinberg on Robortello and Castelvetro, can be absolved of any necessary connection with the fighting parts of this book. Despite what I should think an overeagerness on his part to convict his subjects of un-Aristotelian suppositions, Mr. Weinberg, as in other essays of his not republished here, on Minturno and Scaliger, does a good job of historical reporting and should be read by anyone interested in com-

³ LII (1944), 536-555; see note 27 below. Mr. Ransom spoke back mildly in the same issue. Mr. Murray-Krieger's later “Creative Criticism: A Broader View of Symbolism” (*Sewanee Review*, LVIII, 1950, 36-51) set forth some terms on which he thought “new critics” might be admitted to the Lyceum.

⁴ R. S. Crane and others, *Critics and Criticism Ancient and Modern* (Chicago, 1952), v, 647 p.

paring these Italians with their great exemplar, Aristotle. I believe there is no call here for further praise, and none for blame, of Mr. Weinberg's contributions. Let me enter here too a special appreciation of the historical essays by Mr. Crane and Mr. Maclean. Mr. Crane's "Outline Sketch" of "English Neoclassical Criticism" (reprinted from Shipley's *Dictionary of World Literature*) is a masterpiece of its kind, a historical survey written in the most sweeping and high-powered dialectical style, with yet enough bibliography and quotation to give it the weight of reality. The necessity of streamlining for the encyclopaedic purpose has apparently operated here to produce an economy of organization which is all too lacking in most other parts of this book. Mr. Maclean's essay on the ode and other lyric forms in the eighteenth century seems to me far too long, but its historicocritical content⁵ is concrete and varied, and it has many passages which are among the most sensitively written in the volume.

Five of the essays (222 pages, surely far too great a proportion of the book) are contributed by Mr. McKeon, a specialist in the history of philosophic systems, who looms massively and portentously behind the whole Chicago effort. Two things the Chicago literary critics apparently owe to him as mentor: a deep preoccupation with Aristotle's literary philosophy and a quasi-pluralistic theory regarding various historically recoverable critical systems.

Mr. McKeon's argument about the several systems and their basic assumptions follows a repeating pattern of take and put. The systems are represented mainly as parallels or analogues, using separate vocabularies for separate purposes and not translatable into one another except with great distortion. It is a matter of initial choice or assumption which system one picks. But this account frequently leads up to some sort of amendment or concession to the effect that, after all, the systems somehow do compete and can be compared and preferred to one another; there is some validity and truth if we can only get at it.⁶ With the first of these emphases Mr. McKeon builds up a strong impression of pluralistic sophistication and hands-off tolerance, while with the second, linked to an insistent theme of Aristotelian "literal" and "scientific" criticism, he gains the advantage of seeming to know the secret of the one best way of constructing a poetics. Probably the stronger impression, at least quantitatively, is the pluralistic. The successive critics from Plato to Tolstoy and Richards are in a sense competitors,

⁵ As an essay which professes to explain a sequence of historical causes, it remains rather embarrassingly silent about the concept of folk poetry and related strains of primitivism (strongly continental in color) which influenced the theory and practice of lyric in eighteenth-century England.

⁶ See, for instance, pp. 185, 465-467, 473-478, 490, 504, 523, 537, 539.

but somewhat like a tournament of tennis players playing each by himself in separate courts. The competition is by comparison of "forms" in analogical postures. The critics are shadow boxers in separate rings who can't lay a glove on one another.

Such basic assumptions are apparently not without their effects on Mr. McKeon's own way of thinking and his style of exposition. Here I should like to enter a strong preliminary complaint against the frequent opaqueness of his writing, his absent-mindedness as it were, his neglect to make details of comparisons and antitheses go together, his lack of interest in criticizing the system which he is expounding. This is something I can only interpret as the expressive counterpart of the pluralistic approach to intellectual history, a handicap to vital discourse which might have appeared likely from the outset. From the instances in which his lengthy essays abound, I select just two, both of which have not only a broad doctrinal bearing on my dispute with the literary critics which is to follow, but also an exemplary relation to a principle which those critics strongly tend to deny, that style in writing and thought are intimately dependent upon each other.

The perfection of style or diction in *both* rhetoric and poetic is achieved by choice of language at once *clear* and *appropriate*, without either meanness or undue elevation. The *difference* between poetry and prose is therefore to be found . . . in the fact that clarity is achieved easily in prose by the use of ordinary words, *whereas* meanness is avoided easily in poetry by the use of unfamiliar terms—such as strange words, metaphors, lengthened forms—which depart from the ordinary modes of speech. The center of interest in both poetic and rhetoric is *therefore* the metaphor, but for *opposite* reasons. Prose writers must pay specially careful attention to metaphor, because their other resources are scantier than those of poets, whereas for poets it is the most effective of the numerous poetic forms designed to give diction a nonprosaic character [p. 228].

The italics are mine. Why does it make a definitive *difference* between poetry and prose if you can achieve clarity in prose by ordinary words (*if you can*), and if you can avoid meanness in poetry by extraordinary words (*if you can*)? Waive the question of the truth of either of these statements. There is no real opposition—especially if we note that the norm of both poetry and "rhetoric" is language clear and appropriate. (The difference between my sister and my brother is that my sister has yellow hair, *whereas* my brother has blue eyes.) And why should the importance of metaphor follow (*therefore*) from the preceding muddled antithesis? And again, why is there anything *opposite*, and why isn't there something merely puzzling, in the supposition that metaphor, the most poetic resource of poetry, is the only poetic resource permitted to prose? My second example:

In addition to the task which the poet faces in the construction of his play he faces "problems" which take the form of objections to "errors" . . . he has

committed. Since they are concerned with "errors," these problems are solved by inference from postulates or assumptions which the poet lays down concerning his art, such as would justify him in using as means to his end (which becomes at this stage the proper pleasure caused by his work) devices that may be subject to some defect relative to a science or to morals but irrelevant to the consideration of his art. One of these assumptions is that the standard of rightness in poetry differs from that of politics and other arts, for two kinds of error are possible in poetry; failures of art when the poet intended to describe a thing correctly, and technical errors, proper to some other art or science, which might be justified for the purposes of the poetic art [p. 516].

That is to say, if someone accuses the poet of being at fault through immorality or unreality, he may reply that it is one of his *assumptions* that a poet doesn't have to observe rules of morality or reality. The purposes and pleasures of poetry are just assumed to be different. Aristotle may be as bad as this here and there, but he is not often so flatly question-begging and does not often merely multiply words around so sheer an assumption. If this is his doctrine (I am far from sure it is), I fear both he and Mr. McKeon are going to have to yield both to the Platonic and to the modern critic who says: "What I want to know is why or how it is that a poet can get away with writing something immoral or unreal? Why is there any pleasure attached to this? Just to assume it doesn't advance my understanding at all. There seems to be a strange *fact* here concerning the relation of poetry and morals. This is one thing poetic theory has to *try* to explain. There is no other point in raising the question."

Let me now add some further and more general objections to the style in which the essays composing this volume (and especially those of Mr. McKeon) are for the most part written. The book is long-winded and tiresome; it might well have been shorter by a third or a half without loss of substance. The authors employ a constant procedure of moving away from concrete matters in hand into realms of highly generalized truism. "The object to be produced must first of all be something which can exist, for there could obviously be no production of what cannot exist . . ." There is question here continually of what one might call the irrelevant introduction of general anatomy. "Let me discuss the qualifications of my friend X as candidate for the office of postmaster. Now a postmaster must first of all be a human being, *homo sapiens*, defined hypothetically by the best writers in the Western tradition as a thinking animal—animal the matter, capacity for thinking the form. Animal may in turn be defined . . ." And then the lazy spirals of repetitious exposition, the trickles of almost undetectable emphasis through endlessly repeated congestions of the same quasi-technical language, the shingle

⁷ Olson on Longinus, p. 237.

patterns of progress, half retrospect and half prospect. These are the hallmarks of the Chicago style.

A final fault which I shall mention may be described as a too close assimilation to their historical source and exemplar. Mr. McKeon for pages at a time writes little more than a crowded composite précis of Aristotelian places. Both Mr. Olson and Mr. McKeon are capable of writing at great length in a manner which makes contact only with Aristotle rather than with reality through Aristotle. They achieve a style which is the very image of the Aristotelian lecture notes—the jumpy sequence of flat terms, the final announcements—*οὗτος ἐκεῖνος*. Thus Mr. Olson:

Representation, whether narrative or dramatic, always makes things more vivid, and the latter is more vivid than the former; and it affords the audience knowledge, whether directly or through inference by signs. In any poetic work the audience must at certain times know some things and not know others; generally the denouement discloses all, except in works which have wonder as their prime effect. Unless the audience knows somewhat, emotion is impossible, for emotion depends upon opinion; and unless it is ignorant of certain things, unexpectedness and some kinds of suspense are impossible [p. 563].

This is neither argument nor exposition nor any other kind of real expression.

II

To come nearer now to the central combat aims of the Chicago team, especially as these are summarized in the Introduction by Mr. Crane—I imagine a stage on which stands a figure representing the contemporary critic, a composite, let us say, of Richards, Eliot, Empson, Brooks and Warren, and Tate. He is wearing the mask of his role in the drama to be enacted, a tolerably good, clean, bright critic's mask, though, let us say, it has some smudges on it (the psychologism of Richards, for instance, the excessive ingenuities of Empson). Enter: Professor Crane. He walks up to the critic and, taking a piece of burnt cork from his pocket, proceeds to blacken the mask all over. "There now," he says, "that is what you really look like." Professor Crane then removes the mask from the face of the critic and, with a towel which he has brought along for the purpose, attempts to wipe it off clean, leaving it, however, somewhat more smudged than before and generally somewhat grey. Next he writes across the forehead of the mask the word "Aristotle," the quotation marks being his own. He then puts the mask on his own face. "There now again," he says. "This looks a lot better on me than it did on you. Of course I am well aware that there is really no law that tells us what a critic's mask should be like. You had as much right to

your mask, white or black, as I have to it in its present state. Still, it does look better on me than it did on you."

Other modern critics are said by the Chicago critics to be "dogmatic" and restrictive—the Chicago critics just the opposite. The history of criticism to which they contribute in Part II is described as "the pluralistic philosophy of teaching by example."

And perhaps the most general profit we can derive from it is the habit of viewing critical principles as neither doctrinal absolutes nor historically necessitated beliefs but instruments of inquiry and analysis, to which a critic therefore need not commit himself dogmatically, but only hypothetically . . . [p. 11].

Mr. Crane announces that "they feel a strong temperamental affinity" for Aristotle, but that nevertheless they are not averse to "using for their own ends other great philosophers, from Plato to Dewey." Mr. Crane and his colleagues "have viewed their 'Aristotelianism' as a strictly pragmatic and nonexclusive commitment." But it turns out—immediately and in the same sentence—that they look on the Aristotelian "hypotheses about poetry and poetics" as "capable of being developed into a comprehensive critical method, at once valid in itself and peculiarly adapted to the study of [certain] problems." And these problems are

the problems that face us whenever we reflect on the undeniable fact that what a poet does *distinctively as a poet* is not to express himself or his age or to resolve psychological or moral difficulties or to communicate a vision of the world or to provide entertainment or to use words in such-and-such ways, and so on—though all these may be involved in what he does—but rather by means of his art, to build materials of language and experience into wholes of various kinds to which, as we experience them, we tend to attribute final rather than merely instrumental value [p. 13]⁸

In short, the section of Mr. Crane's Introduction which I have just been summarizing repeats the pattern of retracted pluralism which I have already described in Mr. McKeon's essays. But Mr. Crane is bolder and clearer. The only thing possibly hypothetical or pragmatic or in any sense tentative about his theory is that he has elected to theorize about poetry as poetry and not about something else. Given this choice and interest, he believes his theory valid and peculiarly adapted to discuss poetry as poetry—and he is no less "dogmatic" about this than any other critic who has a theory and believes in it. At another place in his Introduction he writes:

It follows from the pluralistic and instrumentalist view of criticism that we must accord to critics the right of free choice between different basic methods; this is as much a practical decision and hence immune to theoretical questioning, as is the decision (say) to study medicine rather than law [p. 9].

⁸ Cf. p. 646, Crane on *Tom Jones*.

But this is scarcely a convincing parallel. If he wanted to make a parallel, he should have said: "... this is as much a practical decision ... as is the decision to study Roman law rather than common law, or to study medicine out of Galen or out of Cecil's *Textbook of Medicine*." And the second parallel would have revealed the legitimate implications of the pluralistic side of the Chicago philosophy better than the first. The "dogmatic" side of the Chicago theory is necessary if they are to have any theory at all, and I do not deny their right to it. Only it is a bit preposterous of Mr. Crane to keep professing at intervals that the "Aristotelian" method is not a "rival" but only a "needed supplement" to other current methods (p. 23) and that he and his friends are less "dogmatic" than Ransom or Wellek and Warren. Mr. Crane may believe his theory more flexible and more inclusive than theirs (p. 10); he may believe that he has a better theory. But this would not make his theory less "dogmatic" than anyone else's. And if the word "dogmatic" is taken as connoting not only commitment to a theory but a high degree of assurance and an intolerance of other theories, then Mr. Crane and his friends are especially dogmatic.

The Chicago critics profess (on the pages where they develop this side of their statement) to be taking only a pragmatic ride on a borrowed vehicle. I am apprehensive, therefore, that, if I score a hit on them here or there, they are likely to smile and say it is only the vehicle I have hit. Nevertheless, their interpretation of Aristotle and of later critical theory is closely tied in with their own theory and their polemic against other modern critics. In the absence of a clear reason to the contrary in any instance, I shall treat their history as revealing and supporting the sense of their polemic.⁹

This is the place, I believe, for a note on the high degree of respect shown by the Chicago writers for the wholeness and consistency of various separate systems of philosophy and methods of criticism. This follows from, or is needed in support of, Mr. McKeon's basic view of the systems as parallel, discrete, and aloof from one another, rather than successive, partial, and overlapping in an attempt upon common problems. Thus Mr. Olson is so confident about the method and consistency of Longinus that he deduces and fills in the "argument" of the lost portions of the treatise *Peri Hypsous*, amounting to more than a third of the whole. In the same spirit Mr. Keast, though confessing the weighty *prima facie* evidence to the contrary, undertakes to show

⁹ Mr. Crane alludes (p. 1) to the "miscellaneous" nature of the essays which compose the volume, to "differences on incidental points" and "sometimes conflicting discussions of similar themes." Such a disclaimer seems to me entitled to very limited deference by a critic who would do justice to the laboriously obvious "general assumptions and aims" of this volume.

a basic system of assumptions behind the varying critical pronouncements of Samuel Johnson.

The Chicago critics appear a bit more relaxed and reasonable with themselves when Mr. Crane makes the concessions to Plato and Dewey which I have already quoted, and when he says further that the Chicago "reconstructed" Aristotle "may not, indeed, except in a general way, be Aristotle at all!" But "They think it is" (p. 17).

It will be fair, and it will help the exposition, if I attempt a summary confession of my own critical principles. I am what Mr. Olson would call a "syncretist" (pp. 546-547), a person who tries to reconcile the good parts of various important theories and thus to make his own theory. I believe that there are three main poles of literary theory: (1) the mimetic or Aristotelian, which does justice to the world of things and real values and keeps our criticism from being merely idealistic; (2) the emotive (as seen, for instance, in Richards), which does justice to human response to values and keeps criticism from talking too much about either ethics or metaphysics; (3) the expressionistic and linguistic (*par excellence*, the Crocean), which does justice to man's knowledge as reflexive and creative and keeps criticism from talking about poetry as a literal recording of either things or responses. I believe that the second and the third of these poles are present in Aristotle along with the first, though the third, the expressionistic, is surely the weakest and least explicitly developed. I believe that these poles can be made the main points of reference for an indefinitely variable criticism of *all* poems. That is, there are no poems which are in some exclusively proper way "mimetic" and which hence should *not* be considered under the symbolic heads which we shall see Mr. Olson call "didactic" and merely allegorical; and conversely, all "didactic" poems, if they are real poems, are in some important sense "mimetic" and dramatic. Finally, I believe—in direct contradiction, as we shall see, of Chicago doctrine—that analogy and metaphor are not only in a broad sense the principle of all poetry but are also inevitable in practical criticism and will be present there in proportion as criticism moves beyond the historical report or the academic exercise.

III

One of Mr. McKeon's basic distinctions is that between (1) analogical, or dialectical, criticism—criticism which tries to connect poetry with anything else, with science, morals, philosophy, psychology, or linguistics (pp. 473, 530-543)—and (2) what he calls "literal" criticism, that which enables one to talk about poetry or some aspect of

poetry and nothing else. There are several modes of literal criticism more or less incomplete and unscientific (the modes of Longinus, Horace, Richards, for instance), but there is also one which is full and scientific, one which actually defines poetry and its genres. This is the Aristotelian. And here comes a curious clause. The reason why Aristotle's method has this great advantage is that it conceives a poem, or more precisely the mimetic form of poetry found in tragedy, as an object or thing, an "artificial thing," and moreover a thing determined in its unity and structure by a plot which is made up "of incidents, or more literally, of things" (p. 534). This, I say, is very curious. For if anything about poetry is clear at all it is that a poem is not really a thing, like a horse or a house, but only *analogically* so. The analogy I would maintain is a good one, highly instructive, and no doubt the only way by which criticism of a poem (rather than talk about its author and its audience or about its message) can be conducted. But at the same time, a poem is, if it is anything at all, a verbal discourse (a fact which Mr. Crane in his Introduction seems almost to doubt); hence it is a human act, physical and mental.¹⁰ The only "thing" is the poet speaking.¹¹ To treat this act of thought, feeling, and vocal expression not just in its psychological causes nor in its effects on hearers, nor yet in its abstract logical existence as communicable ideas merely, but precisely as a kind of solid "thing," an objectification of thought and feeling in verbal expression, is a requisite for critical thinking. This much one has to insist upon. But that is a long way from making a poem a literal nonverbal object. And it is a long way from making the criticism of the poem "literal" or "scientific" in any privileged sense. A modern critic might well ask what a "literal" theory as prescribed by Mr. McKeon can actually be if not a circularity. What can the predicate of a definition of poetry be if it does not contain terms drawn from the rest of human experience? A way of criticism which does not balk at so radical an analogy as that between poetic discourse and "thing" ought not to balk at other ways of trying to connect poetic discourse with the materials of life to which it refers.

¹⁰ Mr. Olson ("Recent Literary Criticism," *Modern Philology*, XL, 1943, 278) seems to imply that, if only we observe the difference between "natural substances" and "products of art" ("artificial objects"), we can succeed in talking about poems literally as "objects." But I do not see how the one distinction, important as it may be, can exonerate us from a second, which I am urging, between physical objects (either natural or artificial) and verbal acts.

¹¹ "Now in a sense these propositions are not about literature at all. Their subjects when the propositions are stated in a primary form, are not works or the properties of works but persons—writers or readers as the case may be" (R. S. Crane, *English Journal*, XXIV, 648).

It is a commonplace with the Chicago critics to assert that the critics they dislike deal only with "parts" of poems, not with the whole "objects." At the same time they assert that they themselves, the Chicago critics, are peculiarly devoted to the study of the concrete artistic whole (the Aristotelian *synolon*, p. 17). One would gather that Mr. Crane is somehow the inventor of modern holistic and organic criticism, sole champion amid a swarm of "Hellenistic-Roman-Romantic" connoisseurs of figures of speech and poetic diction. I think I may be excused from the task of quoting passages from Richards, Brooks, or Tate to demonstrate their concern for whole works of literary art.¹² Mr. Crane himself (p. 85) has quoted one such emphatic passage from Brooks.

It may be to the point, however, to attempt an explanation of how the charge comes to be made. The reason, I venture to say, is that the wholes contemplated by Mr. Crane and his friends are, not only ideally but actually, those indicated by the main and superficially inspectable shapes of works, those designated by authors and publishers in their title pages—*Aureng-Zebe, a Tragedy, Joan of Arc, an Epic Poem*—and by genre definitions (a whole elegy, a whole didactic poem). Other critics, those attacked by Mr. Crane, have shown a more marked tendency to look on the larger architectural wholes as ideals to be recognized when encountered but also to be tested severely in their parts. Faced with the frequent imperfection of such wholes, these critics have been disposed to recognize the poetic whole where they can find it, even though it is sometimes small and nominally but a part of a larger whole which bears a clearer external title. They have been not averse to finding good small wholes inside good big wholes—for instance, speeches in Shakespearian plays. The holism and organicism of such modern critics as Eliot, Richards, and Brooks (as, earlier, of Coleridge and the Germans) have been something not so much determined by size, titles, and genre definitions as by the value principle of variety in unity or the reconciliation of opposites; and hence it has been something related quite practically to technical principles of ambiguity, polysemy, paradox, and irony. Wholeness is not just a form but a form arising out of a certain kind of matter; wholeness is

¹² In a critique of some early claims of the Chicago critics, in which I made briefly several of the points which I now seek to elaborate (*University Review*, IX, 1942, 139), I quoted I. A. Richards, *Practical Criticism* (1935), p. 302, as follows: "When we have the poem in all its minute particulars as intimately and as fully present to our minds as we can contrive—no general description of it but the very experience itself present as a living pulse in our biographies—then our acceptance or rejection of it must be *direct*." And see, for instance, Tate's judgment of Pound (*Reactionary Essays*, 1936, pp. 43-51).

a certain organization of meaning in words; it supposes a certain grade and intensity of meaning. Some clear contrasts to this philosophy emerge if we examine in detail the performance of the Chicago critics. Thus, Mr. Olson rebukes Empson (p. 50) for not meaning it when he says that ambiguity "must in each case arise from, and be justified by, the peculiar requirements of the situation." But a few pages later (p. 73) Mr. Olson announces that "language can be pleasing in itself, it has an ornamental function in poetry as well." And to show that this is no casual slip, in his later "Outline of Poetic Theory" he expounds with Aristotelian aplomb: "Pleasure in poetry results primarily from the imitation of the object and secondarily from such embellishments as rhythm, ornamental language, and generally any such development of the parts as are naturally pleasing" (p. 556). "Masques, pageants, progresses, etc. are ornaments" (p. 563).

In the midst of an elaborate theory about poetic wholes and a pains-taking analysis of the "working or power" of the "plot" of *Tom Jones*, Mr. Crane pauses to say that there are "qualities of intelligence and moral sensibility" in the author "which are reflected in his conception and handling of the subject" but which can be absent "no matter how excellent, in a formal sense," the work may be (p. 623). "We clearly need other terms and distinctions than those provided by a poetics of forms if we are to talk discriminatingly about the general qualities of intelligence and feeling reflected in *Tom Jones*" (p. 646). These pronouncements by Mr. Olson and Mr. Crane (whether correct or incorrect) suggest that the writers have little conception of the earnestness and thoroughness with which modern criticism has embraced the doctrine of the "whole." None of the critics attacked by the Chicago critics in this volume would come even close to admitting the split between *form* on the one hand and on the other *intelligence* and *feeling* which Mr. Crane so clearly subscribes to. Nor would they, of course, have any part in Mr. Olson's ornamentalism.¹³ It seems strange to me that Mr. Crane should have raised the question of parts and whole against those critics, and that he should hope to come out of an argument about it looking like a better holist than they.¹⁴

¹³ Mr. Ransom, who is named in the Introduction (p. 14), has it is true in later years been talking a kind of ornamentalist language. But in this he is an anomaly among the other critics and is very well aware of it. He doesn't call himself a holist.

¹⁴ One may add that Mr. Maclean in his essay on *Lear* (pp. 599, 602, 607, 608, 612) has no more scruple than other modern critics in talking about the poetic value of incidents, speeches, and words. "In the form of organic life called a poem, 'parts' are 'parts' and in certain senses 'wholes'" (p. 599). Mr. Crane speaks of several kinds of partial values in *Tom Jones*; he admits failure of parts (p. 638), and even (p. 645) "strokes . . . which no one would wish away, yet which are bound to seem gratuitous."

IV

A double charge is made against the modern critics. They are said to treat all poetry by some single exclusive principle (for example, paradox) and hence to neglect many relevant aspects of the "whole." They are also said to be too inclusive, mere analogists trying to reduce poetry to common principles of philosophy, psychology, or verbal discourse. The alternative for the Chicago critics is also double. They waver between saying (1) that all poems ought to be treated strictly as individuals,¹⁵ not as mere instances of some universal idea, or (2) that each poem ought to be seen as belonging to a specific kind, species, or genre of poems (tragic, comic, lyric, didactic) and ought to be treated according to the "causes" which determine this specific kind. By the second alternative, which is the one the Chicago critics lean to, a poem should be treated as an instance not of poetry in general but of a specific kind of poetry. In some passages, as in Mr. Crane's Introduction (p. 15),¹⁶ the Chicago critics deny that they mean to commit themselves to any antique rules of genre (the three unities, or the tragic protagonist of noble lineage), but these denials have very much the appearance of patches applied to a system which is basically different in texture. Mr. McKeon (p. 543) calls such an application of Aristotle a "perversion." It may well be a perversion of Aristotle, but it is one which is strongly invited by the Chicago reconstruction.

The attempt to criticize poetry by "species" goes along with the Chicago interest in objects or things. And so far as the Chicago philosophy is a reaction against positivism, process philosophy, and mere semantics (as it is clearly in Mr. Crane's essay on Richards¹⁷ and near the beginning and end of Mr. McKeon's essay on the "Bases of Art and Criticism"), I am far from having any quarrel with it. But one does the philosophy of "things" no great service by attempting to revive anything like what has always been a "perversion" of that philosophy, the Hellenistic-Roman and neoclassic criticism by rules of genre. The place to defend things and species of things is in the areas where they are found, in the real world, especially the organic, not in that of verbal constructs. Mr. McKeon writes:

The differentiations of the scientific, practical, and artistic uses of language . . . do not depend . . . on classifying statements in fixed genera, as if they had natural forms, definitions, and species [p. 214].

¹⁵ The critic is put in the "predicament of Cratylus, who did not think it right to say anything but confined himself to wiggling his finger in designation of things" (McKeon, p. 204, citing *Metaphysics*, iv, 5).

¹⁶ Cf. Olson, p. 558.

¹⁷ Cf. R. S. Crane, "Semantics and the Teaching of Prose Literature," *College English*, IV (1942), 12-19.

The definitions of the virtues and of tragedy are not statements of the essences of "natural" things but rather of the formation of things which may be changed by human decision and choice [p. 219].

In the light of such statements it is difficult to see how either Mr. McKeon or his colleagues can really believe that poems are "things" or that they are divisible into clean-cut species.

It is true that, as soon as we undertake to define or defend "poetry" or "poem" (as soon, that is, as we are convinced that there is any basic difference between types of discourse such as poetry, philosophy, or science), we are committed to some kind of "real" and "essential" inquiry. Such an inquiry is furthermore an inquiry into value. "Poem" means "good poem." But, as in all our thinking, much depends on where we draw our main lines of discrimination and how many we draw. Literary critics in the Coleridgean tradition, if I understand them, have been Occamites with regard to literary entities and specific values. "Let not the categories be multiplied. We will defend the essential concept of poem, a work of verbal art, and insist that it applies always differently to an indefinite number of individual instances. The names of species (tragic, comic, lyric) will be neutral descriptive terms of great utility, but not different aesthetic essences and not points of reference for different sets of definable rules." The justice of this way of minimizing the essential lines cannot be deduced a priori. It must be seen if at all by experience. The cumulative experience of literary criticism does testify emphatically in favor of this way and against the neoclassic genres and the rules attached to them.

The rigidities of the Chicago system extend not only through the species and subspecies of literature but into certain accessory qualities which are no less definitely conceived as appearing overtly and uniformly through the main parts of a work or else simply as not appearing. The main one of these accessories with which the Chicago critics are preoccupied is "symbol." Toward the end of Mr. Olson's Socratic "Dialogue on Symbolism" occurs (pp. 589-593) a classification which I take the liberty of reducing to a table as follows:

MIMETIC POEM: [Dramatic], narrative, lyric; the poet imitates whole actions; he aims at beauty, which results in pleasure.	{ nonsymbolic (e.g., <i>The Odyssey</i>) symbolic (e.g., <i>Ulysses</i>)
DIDACTIC POEM: The poet seeks to persuade us of some doctrine; the poem results in pleasure.	{ nonsymbolic, e.g., allegory (e.g., Dante's <i>Commedia</i>) symbolic (e.g., Pound's <i>Cantos</i>)
SATIRE: The poet seeks to convince us that something is ridiculous; [the poem results in pleasure].	

ENTERTAINMENT:

The poet is concerned merely with giving pleasure;
 he furnishes only so much beauty or instruction as conduces
 to pleasure; subdivisions: comedy, sentiment, popular morality.

These are all the species and subspecies of poems. More precisely, didactic and mimetic are the only two serious or "real" species of poems. The two main emphases are on the difference between "mimetic" and "didactic" and on that between "symbolic" and "nonsymbolic." The point is that you can't go into a nonsymbolic poem with any bias of symbolism in your mind, and you can't go into either didactic or mimetic with any bias of the other. The parts and completeness of a mimetic poem depend upon an action. The parts and completeness of a didactic poem depend upon a doctrine.¹⁸ The prime example of a didactic poem is Dante's *Commedia*, which is didactic—in the nonsymbolic form! It would be either wrong or unrewarding (Mr. Olson actually means this) to consider action or symbols in this poem!

The chief application of these distinctions is against modern critics—who "are likely to claim that all poetry is didactic, or something of the sort," and who are notoriously given to discovering symbols. Our volume furnishes us with two extended examples of the principle in action, the essay of Mr. Olson against R. P. Warren on *The Ancient Mariner* and that of Mr. Keast against Heilman on *Lear*. It appears to me that both Mr. Olson and Mr. Keast score some points. There is surely such a thing as extravagance in symbolic reading, and it will not be my aim here to adjudicate between the reviewers and the reviewed. What is wrong about the Chicago essays is the doctrinaire principle on which they are written. This comes out with sudden clarity at the end of Mr. Keast's. He announces that he will now present a final objection to Heilman's book, one that is "logically prior to all the others" and one which he has "reserved until now in order not to prejudice the discussion"—in other words, in order not to reveal

¹⁸ The explanation of how we can enjoy a didactic poem even though we are unpersuaded of its doctrine invokes an analogy with rhetoric. "I am pleased by the art of the orator, even though I am not persuaded" (p. 590). At this point I turn back to Mr. Olson's "Rhetoric and the Appreciation of Pope," published thirteen years ago in *Modern Philology*, XXXVI (1939), and rediscover that the proper way to read Pope's satires is as works directed to inducing "belief or conviction," and that "satire and didactic, as invariably involving consideration of the audience, would fall, *not under poetics*, but under rhetoric" (pp. 20-21). Italics, of course, are mine. Mr. Olson has a right to improve his opinions. I do not urge this inconsistency against him, except so far as it illustrates the predicament of his system. I am wondering whether he will arrive at the concept of a poetic *mimesis* of persuasory discourse (see Auden or Pope) and will allow himself to think about the reflexive and ironic possibilities of this without being worried by guesses at what the author was aiming at.

that by prior commitment it was impossible for him to read Heilman's book.

Nothing in the text of the play, nothing in Shakespeare's habits as a dramatist, nothing in the circumstances of its composition and production, nothing in Elizabethan dramatic practice in general, nothing in the dramatic criticism of Shakespeare's day—nothing, in short, internal or external, suggests, or has been thought until recent years to suggest, that a literal reading of *King Lear* will fail to account for essential features of the play and that the tragedy must be interpreted, therefore, as an organized body of symbols [p. 136].

"Internal or external"—the arguments are different. If Mr. Keast thinks symbolism is irrelevant to a full appreciation of this play, that is a limitation of his reading which is without theoretical interest and which at any rate cannot be remedied here. Shakespeare's habits as a dramatist (that is, his other plays) are external to *Lear*, but Mr. Keast's reading of them is presumably subject to the same limitation as for *Lear*. And so for the rest of Elizabethan dramatic practice, though, even if this were clearly and completely nonsymbolic, we might not have to conclude that Shakespeare had not improved on it. The remaining two external heads, the circumstances of composition and production and Elizabethan dramatic criticism, are things that might set up independently some sort of expectancy as to what would be found in a Shakespearean play. But that does not warrant any historical scholar in taking them as prescriptions for what he is going to find there, unless on the theory that writing for the Elizabethan theater precluded symbolism, or that (and here is the real intentionalistic crux) all critical insights stopped shortly after the time of Shakespeare and all sound theory had been developed by then. I am not at all sure that even this appeal to criticism will sustain Mr. Keast on his own terms. Some phrases of Sidney's general poetics begin to come to mind, about "images of virtues and vices" and the like. But if the criticism of Shakespeare has to be sanctioned by the casual and amateur remarks of contemporary gentlemen or by the Italian neoclassicism of the professionals in that day, what are we to say of the whole history of Shakespearean criticism, not only Dryden and Coleridge but Mr. Maclean on *Lear* in this very volume?

V

One very special notion entertained by the Chicago critics is that the only alternative to a genre criticism is an escape into the psychology of the author and reader. Thus they execute what I shall call a double or slant antithesis, one which is not a true or exclusive opposition. They

say that, if criticism leaves the species or kinds of poetry to search for the general definition of poetry itself, then criticism leaves behind also the cognitive object and passes into the realm of general psychology. They seem to assume that there cannot be a general objective discussion of any topic. You have to divide it into its parts or species in order to remain objective. If you try to pick up a pie whole, it will melt into a plan for a pie or the taste of a pie. If you cut it into slices, it will remain pie and *whole* pie. The argument might gain something in plausibility if we were able to entertain that literal equation of poem with physical artifact which has been criticized above. In the realm of artifacts, if we were somehow constrained to talk only about "artifacts" and never or very little about "houses" and "hammers," the objects of our discourse might conceivably tend (at least if we were not on guard) to lose tangibility and become just qualities or, by a further slip, just human aims and methods. But poems, as we have said, are not physical artifacts; they are, to start with, verbal acts. Their definition and defence have to be drawn along a different line.

The kind of slant antithesis I have described is imputed by the Chicago critics to two historical figures especially, Longinus and Samuel Johnson, and to the whole eighteenth century with its Longinian bias. Certain passages in the historical part of the volume make the view much clearer than the argumentative essays. Thus Mr. Keast:

[Johnson] is endeavoring to replace what he considers narrow principles with principles more commodious. And this endeavor regularly leads him to forsake the view of art as manifesting itself in distinct species, a view presented in great detail in the treatises of his predecessors, for the ampler domain of nature . . . Literary works, for Johnson, must be thought of not as specifically identifiable objects, instances of fixed classes of works, and embodying more or less perfectly an ideal form but as human acts to be judged *in relation to the agency of their production and appreciation* [p. 395; cf. pp. 401-406].¹⁹

And Mr. Maclean, who summarizes conveniently some of the main ideas of Mr. Olson's essay on "The Argument of Longinus":

[For Longinus] the totality of an individual poem (unless it be short) and the difference among kinds of poems are aesthetic considerations of little significance. Literary qualities that "transport" must, almost of necessity, occur in short and blinding passages and may occur in any literary genre (poetic, historical, philosophical, or rhetorical). In more modern language, Longinus is concerned not with poems or kinds of poems but with "poetry," or "pure poetry" . . . To Longinus . . . plot and character delineation were subsidiary interests . . . The criticism of the last two centuries, as it has shifted over to a psychological basis, has likewise been marked by a subsidiary interest in plot and its needful agents [p. 413; cf. pp. 418, 421].

¹⁹ The italics are mine. Mr. Crane's sketch of "English Neoclassical Criticism" might be quoted to much the same effect (e.g., p. 384).

Mr. Maclean's essay is about the eighteenth-century shift from the drama or narrative of action to the lyric of passion and image. This shift is seen by the Chicago critics partly as just an historical shift from a preference for one legitimate genre to a preference for another (lyric, we may remember, is one of Mr. Olson's subspecies of mimetic poems); but there is a tendency on the part of Mr. Maclean to see the shift as also a decline from the best or central genre to an inferior one, and furthermore as a shift, or an encouragement to a shift, out of poems and into the psychological sources of poems. The Chicago critics never come to the point of making the full mimesis of Aristotelian tragic theory a requirement for all poems, but there is a strong suggestion that such mimesis is the center of their poetics. And the Aristotelian *synolon*, or whole object, which is the avowed center of their poetics, is indeed best conceived as an external object when the poetic words refer to an action which can be so fully externalized as the Greek drama. At the romantic and lyrical end of the scale, the external action does tend to disappear; there remain the words, expressing emotions tied up with thoughts or with images.

And just here, it seems to me, the Chicago critics suffer one of their main failures of discrimination. They don't seem to distinguish between passion as objectified or embodied in poems—passion, that is, in its grounds and reasons as a public and negotiable "thing," the poem—and passion, along with intentions and other thoughts, as the psychological source of the poem, its inspiration, or "cause" in the efficient sense.²⁰ And it is quite important that one should do so. At different times in history it may have happened that a critic has been guilty of such a double shift as they describe, from specific poems to general psychology. I believe that Longinus actually executed some such maneuver. And I believe that Samuel Johnson's generalizing about works of literary art may be accompanied by a strong inclination to psychologism—though Mr. Keast has perhaps overdone this point (p. 406). I admit too, and have maintained in print, that the romantic and lyric mind tends strongly to slip over into various genetic theories. But what then? Are we to say that all romantic and lyric poems are as weak as romantic inspirational and intentionalistic theory? And do we have to say that all generalizing about the "essence" of poem or even of poetry, rather than about that of tragedy or lyric, is bound to be psychological? As if there were no cognitive and objective generalities.

²⁰ The only one of the Aristotelian four "causes" which is still called a "cause" in ordinary speech. One source of obscurity in the Chicago writing is a resolute program of using "cause" indifferently and without explanation to mean *efficient* cause, *purpose*, *material*, and *form*.

The distinction I am trying to make clear is very happily illustrated by a passage from a letter of Charles Lamb, quoted by Mr. Maclean as if it illustrated a kind of psychologism and geneticism which goes necessarily with an interest in lyric poetry. Lamb refused to accept Coleridge's corrections of his sonnets, because he thought a sonnet was too personal to be corrected by anybody but the author:

I charge you, Col., spare my ewe lambs, and tho' a Gentleman may borrow six lines in an epic poem (I should make no objection to borrow 500 and without acknowledging) still in a Sonnet—a personal poem—I do not 'ask my friend the aiding verse.'²¹

This is full romantic personalism and intentionalism. It is, as I have said, a likely enough attendant upon the lyric poetry of passion, but it is not a necessary attendant. Suppose Lamb had been willing to accept the changes Coleridge made in his sonnets—something by which the sonnets did not necessarily suffer.²² We should then have had romantic lyric poetry of passion *along with* an objective frame of mind about it.

My first point, then, concerning psychologism is that the Chicago critics are far too sweeping in their imputation of this vice to all modern critics in the Coleridgean tradition. My second point is that the Chicago critics themselves are more touched by it than they understand. It is quite clear that they want or believe they want to study the poem, not its origins or its results.²³ But two of the most important terms in the Chicago system are "pleasure" and "purpose." And if these terms have even in Aristotle some tendency away from poems toward genetic and affective psychology, they have it more decidedly for the Chicago critics.

To illustrate first their latent affectivism. A curious confusion appears in a device chosen by Mr. Crane against Brooks and by Mr. Olson against R. P. Warren. They say that Brooks and Warren have been unhappily influenced by a passage in Coleridge (*Biographia*, chap. XIV) which discusses "imagination" as a general power of the mind and "poetry" as a quality which may appear even in philosophy and theology. The influence has been unhappy because this kind of generalization refers only to faculties of the mind (poetic genius) rather than to poems. The passage in the same chapter of Coleridge to which an objective critic should rightly appeal is that in which Coleridge defines a "poem" as "that species of composition, which is

²¹ Page 458, citing *The Letters of Charles Lamb*, ed. E. V. Lucas (London, 1935), I, 19.

²² See Lucas, *op. cit.* I, 24, for an example. Lamb's letter, in large part (pp. 16-20) a running critique, sentimental and playful, of Coleridge's poems as well as his own, goes far to qualify the intentionalism of the passage quoted.

²³ See, for instance, Crane, pp. 22, 646.

opposed to works of science, by proposing for its *immediate* object pleasure, not truth." "It is at this point, with the introduction of ends," says Mr. Crane, "that Coleridge's criticism becomes specifically poetic" (p. 87). But pleasure, *not* truth! What becomes of the Aristotelian thing which was "more serious and more philosophic than history"? That particular statement by Coleridge, with its strong affective emphasis, does not actually go very well with his prevailing intentness upon the visionary dignity of the imagination. The imagination, even if it can appear in Plato and Jeremy Taylor, is after all the "synthetic and magical power" which constitutes poetic genius. I think the modern critics have done well to take the cognitive part of Coleridge's meaning and keep away from the affective lapses.²⁴

As for the other kind of psychologism, the genetic, the case against the Chicago critics is simpler. They are always ready to appeal outside the poem to the intention of the poet. Their point of reference for the unity, the design, the end, of a poetic composition is so heavily schematized that it is almost bound to lie outside the composition itself—in the name or theory, for instance, of some poetic "species." We have already seen Mr. Keast's confession of the extent to which Elizabethan theory limits his own reading of *Lear*. Set beside this the following from Mr. Olson's "Dialogue":

And you would say that the parts and the whole are regulated by the moral doctrine and selected and shown in reference to it?

I would, since Dante himself says so [p. 590].

This intentionalistic principle can be seen very clearly at work in a feature of the Chicago system which I have mentioned in my discussion of parts and whole. I mean the Chicago critics' extreme mistrust of the technique of verbal analysis which other modern critics have cultivated with such nicety. The Chicago critics are likely to admit that "the words are all we have to go by, they alone disclose the poem to us" (Olson, p. 72; cf. p. 254), or that "there is no sharp line to separate the formula expressive of meaning from the meaning expressed in formula" (McKeon, p. 188; cf. pp. 192, 209, 212).²⁵ But they are likely at the

²⁴ And I do not see why any modern critic should have to make a great deal of the statement, quoted of course by Mr. Crane, that no poem of any length either can or ought to be "all poetry." This makes "poetry" like a fluid or a dough, but with the embarrassing complication that a "poem" is a cake which is in part made of poetic dough, but not altogether. The relation between the mould (poetic form) and the dough (poetic material) is, as in the kitchen, quite superficial. This was what happened to Coleridge through juggling with genius, poem, and pleasure. Cf. the comment of Shawcross (*Biographia*, II, 268).

²⁵ "The distinction between arguments directed against the expression and arguments directed against the thoughts is absurd" (McKeon, p. 209).

same time to argue that one ought not to try to get into a play "from the outside in" (Keast, p. 121), as if there were any other way to get inside something. They will speak of "plot, the prime part of tragedy" as something "beautiful" in itself (Olson, p. 556). And having in mind clearly the poet himself rather than the poem or the reader, Mr. Olson will insist that the meaning "determines" and "governs" the words (p. 564) or is "presupposed" by them (p. 254). Both Mr. Crane and Mr. Olson argue repeatedly that the language is only the "means" of literary expression (as Aristotle said) or that it is the "matter" (as Scaliger put it).²⁶ Modern critics, in beginning with the language of poetry, neglect the larger things that loom behind and determine language, that is, plot, character, thought, and passions. When the Chicago critics say words are the "matter" of poetry, they mean that words are the matter of poetry in much the same way as wood is the material of a chair (p. 564) or steel the material of a saw (p. 62) or stone the material of a statue. The stone has the "form," borrowed from the external appearance of a man, imposed upon it.²⁷ Presumably the words of a tragedy somehow have the form of the Oedipus story impressed upon them.

We might push this argument into a serious inquiry whether words really are the "matter" of a poem in the same way that stone is the material of a statue, and then we should have to discuss the peculiarly intimate relation between words and their meaning (convex and concave was Newman's fine image for it), and we should verge on the whole issue of expressionism, which the Chicago critics don't like.²⁸ But I am stressing here the intentionalistic aspect. Mr. Olson and, echoing him recently, the Chicago sympathizer Mr. Hoyt Trowbridge

²⁶ But see McKeon (p. 212): "Discourse not only supplies the matter from which the tragedy is constructed . . . but also the form . . . ; the poem itself, moreover, may be viewed in its unity as a single speech." The interest shown by J. C. Scaliger in the verbal "matter" of poetry is discussed by Mr. Weinberg, "Scaliger versus Aristotle on Poetics," *Modern Philology*, XXXIX (1942), 337-360. Weinberg (pp. 341-343) makes quite clear the Platonic orientation of Scaliger's view of words as matter. Words as mere matter are words considered simply "as sounds." Book II of Scaliger's *Poetics* deals with words just as they enter into feet, meter, rhythms—as if these things could be dissociated from sense. Cleanth Brooks, who has often been accused of being a mere "formalist," becomes in the Chicago terminology a "materialistic monist" (p. 93).

²⁷ Cf. Hoyt Trowbridge, "Aristotle and the 'New Criticism,'" *Sewanee Review*, LII (1944), 547. "In imitation the artist separates some form from the matter with which it is joined in nature—not, however, the 'substantial' form, but some form perceptible by sensation—and joins it anew to the matter of his art, the medium which he uses." Mr. Trowbridge quotes Mr. McKeon. Cf. p. 162 of the present volume.

²⁸ The extensive historical annotations of Mr. McKeon's essay on the "Bases" include some quotations from Spingarn but not a single one from Croce.

say that, if a critic begins with the words of a poem, it is just as if he were to say that "the shape and function of a saw are determined by the steel of which it is made."²⁹ But why wouldn't modern criticism of verbal meaning be more like saying that the goodness of a saw, its capacity to cut, is determined by the steel *fashioned in a certain shape*? I can't think of any modern critics who like to talk about just words and not their meanings and not the way the meanings are shaped together. The shaping of the words together is one main point of modern criticism. The Chicago argument depends on a mixup about form in the saw itself (in which the modern critic would surely be interested) and form (as intention) in the mind of the saw-maker (in which the modern critic might not be interested). The argument ought to talk about what makes the saw cut (i.e., what the saw itself is); but the Chicago argument really talks about what made the saw become what it is, or rather about only part of that. For intention as intention didn't do the trick; intention had to be joined by skill. A man might intend a fine saw and make a botch of it.³⁰

Both the intentionalism and the affectivism of the Chicago critical habit are protected from self-discovery and are capable of being projected upon other critics by virtue of an even more basic habit of mind which we have already discussed, the Chicago uncertainty whether their position is actually pluralistic or "dogmatic." This can be happily illustrated by two short quotations from Mr. Olson on successive pages:

Thus one aspect of art is its product; another, the instrumentality . . . which produced the product . . . another aspect is its production of a certain effect . . . upon those who are its spectators or auditors [p. 548].

Thus—to confine our illustrations to the various criticisms which deal with the product of art—we find criticisms differing as they center on either the subject matter of art or its medium or its productive cause or its end [p. 549].

That is to say, the productive cause of art and its end (its effect) are either not the same as the art product itself but separable topics (p. 548) or, on the contrary, they are aspects of the art taken precisely as art product (p. 549). And we will take them either way, as our own end happens to be either imputing noncritical psychologism to other modern critics or finding leeway for our own system. Neither the intentionalism nor the affectivism of the Chicago critics ever, I believe,

²⁹ Hoyt Trowbridge, *Comparative Literature*, III (1951), 361.

³⁰ Mr. Crane spoke very clearly about geneticism in his essay of 1935 (*English Journal*, XXIV, 657-659). I conjecture that, so far as there is any difference between us on this point, it lies in the fact that Mr. Crane does not recognize "intention" as having a strongly genetic aspect. "Intention" has, I believe, been one of the chief tools of the historical school of literary study which provoked Mr. Crane's essay of 1935.

assumes such rampant and practical forms as my friend Mr. M. C. Beardsley and I were concerned to identify in two essays published a few years ago.³¹ The Chicago psychologism is rather a highly theoretical dimension, a kind of reserve argument backing up at a slight distance the abstractionism and apriorism of their concepts of whole works and of labeled and firmly definable species of works. Psychologism becomes in their thinking just the opposite of what they say it is, not the wholesale modern alternative to classical genre criticism but an escape clause of genre criticism in its twentieth-century Chicago version.

VI

One of the most ingrained traits of the Chicago critics is their lack of generosity toward all other modern critics, and this is the less ingratiating when joined with their almost abject deference to Aristotle. They hardly ever assume the grace of acknowledging a good idea when they find it in any modern critic.³² The limitations which they impute to other critics are, for the most part, not errors arising radically out of inferior assumptions, terms, and methods, but limitations arising from the nature of poetry itself and inherent in the project of talking about poetry more or less scientifically.³³ The tone assumed by the Chicago critics would lead one to think that they had found nearly final answers to the problems of criticism or at least much better answers than anyone else.

But one of the most obvious features of their system is the meagerness of its fruits in practical criticism. The Chicago critics are people who have a fine blueprint of an automobile and sit around complaining that Henry Ford got started on the wrong principles. Their small output of practical criticism, furthermore, runs counter to other contemporary criticism far less than they would maintain. There is not much that is distinctive about it. In the present volume, only the last two pieces, Mr. Maclean's on *Lear* and Mr. Crane's on *Tom Jones* (53 pages of the total 647), are essays in practical criticism. Aside from these, Mr. Maclean in his other essay sketches a critical approach to some neoclassic odes, and Mr. Crane in a footnote on Brooks sug-

³¹ *Sewanee Review*, LIV (1946), 468-488; LVII (1949), 31-55. The leaning of Mr. Olson (p. 561) and Mr. Maclean (pp. 596, 605, 608) toward suspense and vividness is a form of moderate affectivism upon which I need not dwell here.

³² Some exceptions occur in the notes to Mr. Crane's essay on *Tom Jones*.

³³ "The subject matter of the practical and productive sciences does not permit as much precision as is possible in the theoretic sciences" (McKeon on Aristotle, p. 219). Mr. Maclean, p. 428, is content to call criticism a form of "medial discourse."

gests how he would go about doing Gray's *Elegy*. I don't wish to urge objections to any of this criticism. Yet it would be out of proportion to the main emphasis of the Chicago volume and to the purpose of this essay if I were to stop long enough for praise. Mr. Maclean exerts a kind of feverish grace in a sound enough celebration of some parts of *Lear*, under the heavily stressed commonplaces of the *intelligible*, the *interesting*, *unexpectedness*, *suspense*, *vividness*, and *probability*. Mr. Crane writes some pages (see especially pp. 634-637) of fine enough insight into the special comic plot of *Tom Jones*, but the critical method is unusual only in the lengthy methodological preamble by which the insights are apparently sanctioned. "I take the poetic form of the *Elegy*," says Mr. Crane, "to be that of an imitative lyric of moral choice, representing a situation in which a virtuous, sensitive, and ambitious young man of humble birth confronts the prospect of his death while still to 'Fortune and to Fame unknown' . . .," etc. (p. 99). We know the proper species of the *Elegy*; we can write a précis of it. If this or some elaboration of this has to be compared with Brooks' chapter on the *Elegy*, I think the retort from Brooks might be simply that he took all this (except possibly the genre formulation) more or less for granted; that is where he started. And the retort of the consumer of criticism ought to be that Brooks is more adventuresome and interesting; he tries at least to penetrate the stereotypes. There is a point at which this controversy begins to sound not a little like "men of sense" against "men of wit."

The Chicago critics expect too much of their system, too little (despite occasional protests to the contrary) of their own capacity to read poems and respond to them. They are the Scaligers, not the Aristotles, of modern criticism. Their program seems to me scarcely calculated to advance the cause either of literary criticism or of a vital neo-Aristotelianism. They have had little or nothing to say about the main issues raised by what they call the "dialectical," rather than "literal," criticism of our time—the relations which poetry bears to religion, morals, philosophy, psychology, science, and language. In short, they turn their backs on the whole modern critical effort to scrutinize the relation of poetry to the rest of life. They wish to construct a definition of poetry which will be strictly self-contained—that is to say, circular.

Mr. Crane's Introduction complains that the Chicago critics have before now been accused of such extreme and mutually inconsistent positions as, on the one hand, relativism and "aesthetic atomism" and, on the other, "pseudo-Aristotelian formalism." But something like these names will have to stand. The diversity of the charges results

from the shiftiness of their tactics, their pluralism devoted to removing the systems of other critics, their dogmatism devoted to setting up their own instead. The Chicago system grew out of two minds saturated with the history of ideas, Mr. Crane's and Mr. McKeon's, and the system remains, despite the "bold" reorientation toward criticism which Mr. Wellek once kindly imputed to it,³⁴ in one of its two main postures a historical one. It is difficult to know on which side of their general dialectic one ought to lay a concluding emphasis. But the union of their highly schematized dogmatism and their pluralism tempts me to let a Chicago critic write his own ending. Here are the final words of Mr. Olson's "Dialogue on Symbolism":

And he saw that there were many other approaches to the temple by ways not his and that these too offered a view, although a different view from his, and like it only in that they too were of reflections only. And, being a shadow, he was content; for the shadow must be content with the shadow of knowledge and rise as if full-fed from the shadow of food. Are you not also content?

I am content.

Yale University

³⁴ But without thanks; see p. 1.

BENEDETTO CROCE: LITERARY CRITIC AND HISTORIAN

RENÉ WELLEK

WITH the death of Croce, on November 20, 1952, in his eighty-seventh year, not only a great philosopher, aesthetician, historian, politician has passed, but also a great literary critic, a highly influential theoretician of literature, and a learned investigator of literary history. Croce was certainly a practical *comparatiste*; he not only studied relations (e.g., between Spain and Italy, Germany and Italy),¹ but always kept the literary map of Europe in mind, comparing, contrasting, ranging over it, from Homer to Gerard Manly Hopkins.

But Croce was no friend of the usual *comparatisme*, the studies of themes and motifs, sources and influences, for their own sake. In reviewing the prospectus of one of the predecessors of this journal, Woodberry, Fletcher, and Spingarn's ill-fated *Journal of Comparative Literature*, in 1903,² Croce asked pointedly: What is comparative literature? If it means the comparative method, then it obviously goes far beyond literature and is constantly used in the study of even a single author. If it means the tracing of literary themes and influences, it is useful but leaves us with a feeling of emptiness. "These are merely erudite investigations, which in themselves do not make us understand a literary work and do not make us penetrate the living core of artistic creation." They refer only to the after-history of a work already formed (its fame, translations, imitations, etc.) or to the materials which may have contributed to its origins. But if we define comparative literature as the study of all antecedents of a work of art, philosophical and literary, then it is identical with all literary history and the word "comparative" is really a superfluous pleonasm. There is only a choice between mere literary erudition and a truly historical and interpretative method.

It is needless to say that Croce always preferred this second alternative, though he himself was immensely erudite. *Stoffgeschichte*, especially, was the target of his criticism. In reviewing, for instance, a German thesis on the different dramas based on the Mary Queen of Scots story,³ Croce scores the false assumption that a historical fact is an

¹ *La Spagna nella vita italiana durante la Rinascenza* (Bari, 1917).

² "La letteratura comparata," in *Problemi di estetica*, 4th ed. (Bari, 1949), pp. 71 ff.

³ "Storia di temi e storia letteraria," *ibid.*, pp. 77 ff.

aesthetic theme which has its laws of artistic representation; there is no continuity between the different versions of the Mary Stuart theme or any theme of this kind. In comparing different handlings of such themes, one can throw light on the changes in political ideas, customs, sentiments, in short, on the history of civilization, but never on the history of literature and poetry as such.

Croce also attacked the conception of literary history as an evolutionary process. He criticized severely what he called the sociological conception of literary history exemplified for him in all romantic histories of literature which conceive of literature as an expression of a national spirit, and *a fortiori* in all positivistic histories which make literature directly reflect a specific ideology (Brandes) or explain it in terms of race and milieu (Taine). Croce, of course, recognized the immense advance which such historiography, in the hands of the Schlegels or Taines, represented, as compared to the purely erudite accumulations of eighteenth-century learning. But he also saw that it made literature a product of something else, that it confused art with the intellectual and practical forms of the spirit (with philosophy and morality). When he was confronted with the theories and practice of Heinrich Wölfflin, who advocated a history of art which would be a truly internal history of its development, of its devices, techniques, and assumptions, Croce also refused to accept this solution of the problem. It follows from his aesthetic theory that devices and techniques, rhetorical categories and genres, get short shrift. Such history appeared to Croce an arid academic exercise or at most a history of fashions and customs, a history of civilization which has nothing essential to say to a man interested in the central problem of criticism—the imagination of the poet.

In his proposal for a "reform of the history of literature and art,"⁴ he argued that the only proper literary history is the *caratteristica* (critical characterization) of a single artist, of both his personality and his work, which form a whole. Such a characterization of a poetic personality, he asserted, has nothing in it that is static and naturalistic, but is intrinsically and eminently genetic and historical; e.g., it "will show how an artist will in his beginnings try to imitate previous art, whether near or far removed in time or place, how in this imitation he will introduce more and more contradictory elements, the stronger his own personal temperament turns out to be, and how, at last, he will find himself and create something original." The unit thus will always be an essay or a monograph, and the production of sociological and general histories of literature and the arts will and should decline. They are kept alive only by the practical requirements for encyclopaedic information.

⁴ "La riforma della storia artistica e letteraria," in *Nuovi saggi di estetica*, 3rd ed. (Bari, 1948), pp. 157 ff.

Croce substantially followed his own advice and instincts and steadily produced a stream of essays, of "characterizations," which focus sharply on the one problem he considered essential. "Criticism," he said in a letter to this writer, summarizing a conversation on June 5, 1952, "does not require anything else than to know the true sentiment of the poet in the representative form in which he has translated it. Any other demand is extraneous to the question." If one asks that the series of monographs and critical essays be put into some order, the answer is that "everyone can put it into any order he pleases." There is no continuity (except an external one) between Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch, or Pulci, Boiardo, and Ariosto. They are all different, and the critic's task is to grasp, to describe, and thus implicitly to evaluate this individuality, this uniqueness. Croce has done this in hundreds of essays which take up practically every figure of Italian literature and many authors in other languages.

He began writing such practical literary criticism comparatively late, in 1903, when he founded *La Critica*. At first, he concentrated on the contemporary or near-contemporary literature of Italy, severely judging what he considered the decadence, the false aestheticism of the late nineteenth century. D'Annunzio, Fogazzaro, Pascoli, and later Pirandello were his main victims, while Carducci was his lifelong favorite among recent Italian poets. The standard of judgment by *liricità* as interchangeable with true poetry seems to suggest romantic assumptions of lyrical self-expression. Actually, the term has little to do with the romantic overflow of feeling, and Croce was always severe towards mere sentimentalism, good intentions, or raw emotion.

From contemporary Italian literature his criticism moved increasingly into the past and into other countries. The book on Goethe (1917) was his first long critical essay which attempted to trace a personal evolution and took seriously the union of personality and work. It is a refreshing book because it is free from the usual German indiscriminate idolatry of Goethe and even his slightest works, and still expresses great admiration, love, and understanding for what is genuinely great in the man and poet. Croce, with his concept of *liricità*, was able to brush aside all questions about the unity of *Faust* and to treat it almost as an album in which Goethe entered his feelings at different times of his life. Croce could say that he considered "matters of structure as aesthetically indifferent" and "questions of plan and intention as of another world than that of the world of sentiment and imagination which is that of poetry."⁵ The same basic thesis is behind the little book on Dante (1920). This book caused an enormous debate and could hardly convince by the radi-

⁵ "Recenti lavori tedeschi di critica del *Faust*," in *Goethe*, 4th ed. (Bari, 1946), II, 101. For a fuller discussion, see Lienhard Bergel, "Croce as a Critic of Goethe," *Comparative Literature*, I (1949), 349-359.

cal distinction there drawn between the "theological-political romance," the structure as an abstract scheme, and the poetry which grows around it like luxurious vegetation.⁶

Both the Dante and Goethe books make an effort to elaborate what to Croce must always be the central critical problem, the distinction between poetry and nonpoetry, or between poetry which is "classical," i. e., a successful union of inspiration and discipline, and poetry which is mere feeling, mere emotion, poetry which is purely oratorical, directed toward a practical effect, or poetry which is intellectualistic, didactic, instructive. A late book, *La poesia* (1936), works out these distinctions most clearly, sharply discriminating also between poetry and literature—"literature" meaning writing in its civilizing function. The volume of little essays, *Poesia e non poesia* (1922), which in the English translation is misleadingly called *European Literature of the Nineteenth Century*, is an early application of these criteria and distinctions to figures somewhat haphazardly picked from the nineteenth century. Thus Schiller is put down as a philosophical rhetorician, thus Kleist is described as a poet merely striving by will power to become one, while George Sand is severely judged as propounder of the gospel of romantic love, a case history for a moment of civilization, not a true artist. Scott appears to Croce to be merely a manufacturer of books, a "hero of commerce," and an antiquarian who approaches poetry only in rare moments of human kindness; while Maupassant is highly appreciated though shown to be limited to one theme and one feeling. These distinctions are also applied with vigor within the work of an author. Thus Leopardi, in an essay which caused much offense, is disparaged as a thinker and shown to be very limited in the expression of his own feeling—disappointment with life—while he achieved poetry in Croce's sense of serenity only in the idylls.

The method is always one and the same. Croce selects what he considers poetry, brushes aside what is something else, and tries to define a leading sentiment, something like Taine's *faculté maîtresse*, which allows him to characterize by constant qualifications. Two essays out of the three collected in the book, *Ariosto, Shakespeare, Corneille* (1920), are particularly striking examples. Ariosto is shown to be inspired by a desire for cosmic harmony which pervades every single sentiment of his work and all his language and meter; Corneille is dominated by one passion, the ideal of free will. Each essay reaches what seems a rather meager conclusion by a process of elimination, by surveying the different solutions given by other critics, since Croce believes that the process of criticism is also a historical process, a dialectical argument against and with others. The essay on Shakespeare, though it contains a fine

⁶ *La poesia di Dante*, 6th ed. (Bari, 1948), p. 59.

execution of conventional and foolish Shakespeare scholarship, seems to me inferior; Croce does not, I think, see into the tragic depth of Shakespeare or grasp his intense power of language, but he formulates excellently his feeling for life and his strong sense of right and wrong. Croce is quite falsely judged if we think of his criticism as narrowly aesthetic; it is, rather, strongly ethical, even "psychological," if, of course, we recognize that he makes the distinction between an empirical and a poetic personality, and studies only the latter.

After these essays Croce began more and more to indulge himself; in the last years of his life, he gave up elaborate attempts at critical evaluation and characterization and published volumes which can almost be called anthologies with commentary. They apply the method to a wide range of texts. For instance, *Poesia antica e moderna* (1940) has little chapters on Homer, Terence, Lucretius, Virgil, Catullus, Propertius, Horace, Juvenal, Martial, then comments on Walter von der Vogelweide, Bertran de Born, Petrarch, Góngora, Racine, Molière, Diderot, Burns, Hugo, Baudelaire, etc., and ends with the beloved Carducci. The standards seem relaxed, the mood much more tolerant, the personality of the critic frequently suppressed. The essays on Burns and Hopkins are little more than a series of translations. Even his new review of his near contemporaries⁷ is somehow more mellow, more just in recognizing even alien merits; D'Annunzio, Fogazzaro, and Pascoli are treated with more kindness.

But it would be a mistake to speak simply of a decline of Croce's powers. Rather, his interest shifted from the kind of criticism he had practiced, and apparently his basic conception of poetry changed. Croce was a Neapolitan patriot and some of his greatest and certainly most time-consuming interests were devoted to local history. He made innumerable contributions to the history of Naples—political, spiritual, theatrical—and even to the history of its manners. The devotion to two Neapolitans, Vico and De Sanctis, whom he thought his nearest intellectual ancestors, was central in his life. Naples, as it is today, is still a baroque city and Croce in studying Naples' past was inevitably absorbed with the baroque. But, paradoxically, though he felt considerable imaginative sympathy with the baroque period and even devoted much effort to resuscitating and editing the Marinist poets or a seventeenth-century story teller like Basile, he always disparaged the baroque as a style. He defined the concept bluntly as a "form of artistic ugliness" and, in practice, as "that artistic perversion dominated by a desire for the stupefying, which can be observed in Europe from the last decades of the sixteenth to the end of the seventeenth century."⁸ He held fast to this low

⁷ In Vol. VI of *Letteratura della nuova Italia* (Bari, 1934).

⁸ *Storia della età barocca in Italia*, 2nd ed. (Bari, 1946), pp. 24, 33.

valuation of the poetry (supported by the very real hollowness of the actual Italian Marinists) in *Storia della età barocca in Italia* (1929). He could do this because in this book, which seems to violate his principle of not writing literary history, he was writing primarily a history of culture. He could call chapters "The Silence of Great Poetry" or "Baroque Pseudopoetry," and still justify the age because he looked for and found the germs of renovation. In philosophy, where Vico is being prepared, and in moral life the Italian *Risorgimento* seems almost at hand.

From the baroque, Croce the historian moved more and more into the past and came to modify his concept of poetry considerably. *Poesia popolare e poesia d'arte* (1933) seems to be the turning point. Here Croce, who had always embraced the Vichian concept of poetry as something completely nonintellectual, though "theoretical," as sensuous, immediate, passionate, as coming in small spouts of energy, has changed his front. He severely criticizes the conception of folk poetry; he sees the learned roots of Italian poetry, he appreciates the Petrarchan tradition, and he writes with sympathy even of sixteenth-century comedy: of Machiavelli as a playwright, Aretino, Bibbiena, and others. The book even contains chapters divided by kinds—the popular epic, comedy, tragedy, the lyric—though Croce still asserts that these distinctions are purely empirical and never imply any judgment by genre ideals. While clinging to his fundamental identification of intuition and expression, to his definition of poetry as *liricità*, he has considerably reinterpreted his concept; it allows him to include the artificial and the traditional, to see poetry much more as a craft, as "making," than he had seen it before.

The enduring importance of Croce for the literary student, however, may, paradoxically, rest less on his strictly literary criticism and history than on his aesthetics and his history of aesthetics and in his theory and history of historiography. Much of this is outside the scope of this essay, but surely literary students will and must learn from Croce's sharp delimitation of the realm of art and the nature of the aesthetic, from his acute criticisms of the alternative conceptions of art—hedonistic, pragmatic, intellectualistic, etc.—from his relentless objections to any classification of the arts and kinds, from his rejection of rhetoric, stylistics, and all concepts such as the "tragic" or the "humorous." We may not be able to accept his complete identification of intuition and expression (with the resultant exclusive emphasis on the inner vision of the artist), we may hesitate to follow his radical rejection of the old classifications and kinds. But we will surely be forced to rethink them and to find a new ground for them to stand on. We are, at least, always brought by Croce face to face with philosophical problems and must re-

alize that he is right when he holds that criticism requires philosophical decisions and is ultimately a part of philosophy.

One of Croce's very first publications was *La critica letteraria* (1894), a sketch which, by its implications, could not have met with the approval of the later Croce, but which anticipates, at least negatively, much that he had to say on this topic. His definitions and classifications of the various operations which he considers wrongly grouped together as "literary criticism" is still pertinent today, and we find the same criticism of the biographical approach and of the theory of genres which he developed far more radically later on. But the consideration of aesthetic judgment comes to surprisingly relativistic conclusions, and the whole discussion is not yet imbued with his later systematic spirit. Yet precisely the historical position of the little book makes it relevant even today to the American situation. Croce was arguing at a time when Spencer and the positivists were triumphant in Italy before they were routed by Croce and Gentile; in this country the situation today is similar to that of the 1890s, with hedonistic, psychologistic, and intellectualistic conceptions of art still widely prevalent.

In his reaction against scientism, Croce came for a time to defend a view of creative criticism, of criticism as creation, as art. He went so far as to say, "if I penetrate the innermost sense of a canto of Dante's, I become Dante."⁹ But later, I think more wisely, he considered imaginative re-creation as only a presupposition of criticism and concluded that criticism and history are a translation from the realm of feeling into the realm of reason and thought. He found that critics should be reminded of the prohibition posted in some German concert halls: "Das Mitsingen ist verboten." He described the method of De Sanctis, the critic whom he most admired, as if he were describing his own. There is no question of De Sanctis reproducing the episode of Francesca da Rimini in his famous discussion; rather it is a polemic against problems extraneous to art, which are usually introduced into examinations of the passage; and by the process of elimination our attention is focussed on the poetry of the canto, on the particular sentiment which Dante expressed in the tragic and loving figure of Francesca. The objection that criticism moves into a sphere completely remote from art is countered by Croce's argument that thought is the beginning of a new sentiment and act, that better understanding means deeper enjoyment. There is also no contrast any more between aesthetic and historical criticism. Biographical knowledge is still considered unnecessary, mere antiquarianism, extraneous—but not historical knowledge, imaginative insight into a particu-

⁹ "Le categorie rettoriche e il prof. Gröber (1900)," in *Problemi di estetica*, 4th ed. (Bari, 1949), p. 155.

lar age and mind, though causal explanation seems to him useless, since it leads only to an infinite regress.¹⁰

Besides Croce's aesthetics and innumerable discussions of the methodology and theory of criticism, any literary student will have to pay attention to Croce as a historian of literary ideas, of aesthetics and poetics. Two-thirds of the *Estetica* (1902) is a history of aesthetics. His discovery of Vico as an aesthete (hardly appreciated in his significance before Croce), his discussions of Baumgarten and Schleiermacher,¹¹ and especially his many analyses of De Sanctis¹² are major contributions to any history of critical thought. One may feel that sometimes Croce is too much preoccupied with tracing only the one line of thought leading to his own central conceptions; but his erudition, his analytical power, his skill in marshalling facts and pulling together what seems remote is so great that every article of his is worth meditating and digesting.

His literary criticism, in the strict sense, appears more limited. It is inspired by a clear philosophy and basic pathos; but it seems to me more seriously limited by a specific taste than his more freely ranging philosophical and aesthetic speculations. It does not stand or fall with our accepting his system of aesthetics *in toto*, but it is circumscribed by a personal taste which is also that of a particular time. His *liricità* and *classicità*, though theoretically wide concepts identical with all genuine poetry, are still, in practice, somewhat exclusive. He rejects the baroque and much of what we would admire most in modern poetry since Baudelaire. Croce himself had a ruling sentiment, was a historical personality in his own sense, unique even in his limitations, as we all are.

Yale University

¹⁰ "Alcune massime critiche e il loro vero intendimento," in *Nuovi saggi di estetica*, 3rd ed. (Bari, 1948), especially pp. 223 ff.

¹¹ On Baumgarten and Schleiermacher see, besides the *Estetica*, *Ultimi saggi*, 2nd ed. (Bari, 1948).

¹² On De Sanctis see especially *Una famiglia di patrioti ed altri saggi storici e critici*, 3rd ed. (Bari, 1949), and *Saggio sullo Hegel seguito da altri scritti di storia della filosofia*, 4th ed. (Bari, 1948).

BOOK REVIEWS

I MANIFESTI ROMANTICI DEL 1816 E GLI SCRITTI PRINCIPALI DEL "CONCILIATORE" SUL ROMANTICISMO. Edited by Carlo Calcaterra. Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1951. 452 p.

The first issue of the *Biblioteca italiana* of Milan, published in January 1816, carried the well-known article in which Madame de Staël urged Italian writers to familiarize themselves with foreign literatures as a means of liberating themselves from pedantry and formalism. This article aroused immediate antagonism; but three writers, Ludovico di Breme, Pietro Borsieri, and Giovanni Berchet, gave prompt support to her position in substantial pamphlets, all three of which were published in Milan before the end of the year. Di Breme's *Intorno all'ingiustizia di alcuni giudizi letterari italiani* appeared in June; Borsieri's *Avventure letterarie di un giorno o Consigli di un galantuomo a vari scrittori* in September; and Berchet's *Sul Cacciatore Feroce e sulla Eleanora di Goffredo Augusto Bürger, Lettera semiseria di Grisostomo al suo figliuolo* in December.

These three documents are now for the first time assembled and thoroughly edited in the volume under review, and to them there are added seven articles published in or prepared for the Milanese biweekly, *Il Conciliatore*, which during its single year of existence, from autumn 1818 to autumn 1819, was the most important periodical published in Italy.

In addition to the fully annotated texts themselves, the volume contains a long general introduction, a rich general bibliography, an introduction for each "manifesto" and for the group of articles from the *Conciliatore*, and an index.

The first and third of the three manifestoes are well known; but Borsieri's *Avventure* has not enjoyed the attention it deserves (Calcaterra's annotations are the first it has received), and a brief report of its general character and of some of its statements may therefore be of interest.

The *giorno* of the title is a day in which the author has a series of imaginary conversations in a bookshop, in a boudoir, in a café, on a walk in the public gardens, in a chance meeting with a poet (Monti), at a dinner, and in a theater. This framework is handled cleverly, and a pleasant Horatian humor pervades the pamphlet. The most frequently recurrent themes are the justification of Madame de Staël, the value of familiarity with foreign literatures, and the pettiness of current Italian criticism.

A long paragraph on the proper function of the critic begins thus: "Ma presa occasione dal poema che si annunzia, svolgere le universali teoriche del 'sublime,' del 'bello,' del 'semplice,' che sono i tre grandi caratteri di ogni eloquenza di prosa o di verso, e riscontrarli praticamente nel poema che hai per le mani . . ." "I falsi letterati" exalt a type of production which requires only "la pazienza e la volontà": "Ma dove è necessaria una volontà fortemente commossa dall' amor del vero, dove è necessario per sorgere aver sortito dalla natura il privilegio d'una mente capace di profonde concezioni, e di un animo squisitamente sensibile a ciò che è bello, grande, virtuoso; dove in fine si vogliono le doti che formano i grandi poeti, i grandi filosofi morali, i grandi scopritori d'incognite verità, ivi pochi riescono."

The choice and the harmonious arrangement of words constitute only the mechanical and material part of style: "L' intrinseca, che ne costituisce l'essenza, è la forza del concetto, la luce delle immagini, il calore degli affetti che debbono esservi per entro diffusi con giusta proporzione." The criticism that makes much of linguistic minutiae is represented as "una vecchierella coperta di veli ingialliti dal tempo, che chiusa in un enorme guardinfante si mova alta sul tacco a passi di minuetto." Familiarity with foreign literatures brings the delightful contemplation of previously unknown forms of beauty, and opens previously untouched sources of invention for poetic fancy. Dante, Petrarch, and Ariosto profited from their knowledge of French and Provençal authors; if they were living today they could not fail to meditate on the works of Shakespeare, Schiller, and Calderón: "Nè stranieri devono essere mai chiamati gli scrittori veramente grandi. Poichè le belle ed utili opere loro li rendono cittadini di tutti que' paesi in cui sono lette e studiate."¹

The seven articles from the *Conciliatore* include one by Romagnosi (who maintains that he is neither a *romantico* nor a *classico* but an *Ilichastico* . . . cioè *adattato alle età*); Ermes Visconti's "Idee elementari sulla poesia romantica" and a dialogue of his on the dramatic unities; Berchet's "Della Romanticomachia" and a review of *Narcisa* (a romantic poem by Tedaldi-Fores, derived from Young's *Night Thoughts*); and two broadly political articles by Adeodato Rossi (the publication of which was prevented by the censor).

Calcaterra's Introduction, an essay of some fifty pages, is the most mature, the most penetrating, and the wisest discussion of Italian romanticism known to me. He deals not merely with what may be called the deliberate Romantic Movement, initiated by the three manifestoes, but also with what may be called the general romantic resurgence—a resurgence which, beginning as early as the time of Vico, is even yet not wholly spent, a resurgence which produced in Italy effects largely different from those of northern romanticism and assumed various and often partially contradictory forms in various writers.

The essence of romanticism, as Calcaterra sees it, is the liberation of the individual spirit. In Italy the liberation was threefold. It was, in the first instance, a liberation from a concept of life dominated by a hedonistic sensism and a Cartesian rationalism. It was also a liberation from acquiescence in moral and national servility—a liberation which, overcoming impossibilities by persistent faith, became the spiritual driving force of the Risorgimento. And it was also a liberation, in literature from the conventional imitation of ancient models—without denial, however, of the eternal values, so deeply cherished in Italian minds and hearts, of the classics themselves. *Artes poeticæ* were obsolete: Di Breme, writing of the young Manzoni, said: "La sua poetica è nell'anima."

The second half of the Introduction is devoted to an intimate and revealing consideration of the three manifestoes, among which Di Breme's stands out not only as the first, but also as the most courageous, the widest-ranging, the most incisive, and the richest in conclusions that are still worth pondering.

ERNEST H. WILKINS

Newton Centre, Massachusetts

¹Borsieri, convicted of liberal political activities, spent the years 1824-36 at hard labor in the Spielberg. On his release he came to this country, where for two years he earned a precarious living as a teacher of Italian in New York, Princeton, and Philadelphia. He then returned to Europe, and eventually to Italy; but he was never able to fulfill the literary promise of his youth.

UNA ANTOLOGIA DE LA LÉRICA NORD-AMERICANA. By Agustí Bartra. México: Edicions Lletres, 1951. 318 p.

This collection of all significant American poets from Whitman to MacLeish won the Cebrià Montoliu Prize offered for the best example of cultural exchange between Catalonia and the United States at the *Jocs Florals* in New York on October 6, 1951.

The author, Agustí Bartra, a dynamic poet of the contemporary scene, is here revealed in a new light. For his just and keen appraisal of the poets whose work he presents goes simply and directly to the heart of the matter in a manner quite different from that of the professional critic. It is also intriguing to see what such an outstanding poet of the moment thinks of his American confrères and to observe a Catalan's choice of their poems. Such a selection, he freely confesses, must be both provisional and perilous, since each reader has to be guided by his own taste and inclination. His aim, however, has been to produce a panorama of the American spirit as seen through its poetry, the most important characteristics of which he defines as social conscience, the desire to create the American saga, and the need of expressing oneself in terms of human values.

He dates the contemporary movement from the publication of *Leaves of Grass* in 1855, although not all that has been produced since then falls within that movement. To a European, a striking aspect of this period lies in the absence of schools of thought or style (with the exception of the Imagists) and the consequent variety of individual expression.

The poets are treated in the chronological order of their dates of birth. The poems of each are preceded by an excellent and succinct biographical and bibliographical sketch, containing a just and often penetrating evaluation of his place in the contemporary field.

To Bartra, the most important of these poets are Whitman and Emily Dickinson. His admiration of the former is natural to his generation and his own poetical trend: the philosophy of life in *Song of Myself* and *Full of Life Now*; the war experiences of *Strange Vigil I Kept* and *When Lilacs Last in the Door-yard Bloomed*, which would touch one who had just emerged from the bitter years 1936-40; the personal feeling that inspired *The Last Invocation* and *Living Always, Always Dying*; *City of Ships* and *The Beach at Night* with their natural appeal to a Barcelonian; and *Beautiful Women*, in its similarity to that characteristically Catalan type of epigram, *l'instant*.

His appreciation of Emily Dickinson is equally natural. Her profound intuition of the true and eternal is characteristic of Bartra and of all the universalists of contemporary Catalan poetry. Her genius for evoking the above-mentioned *instants* in simple, unadorned, essential words and her zest for the essence of the word itself is also akin to a vital spark of twentieth-century Catalan literature. For this reason he chooses her poems of a more universal nature, independent of their New England setting.

Frost, Sandburg, and Masters are selected as realists in opposition to the exhausted classicism of the first two decades of this century. The pessimism of Edwin Arlington Robinson is effectively contrasted with that of Jeffers; and Eliot is considered the greatest poetic influence in modern literature of the English language, although not the greatest of its poets. Among the rest, Edna St. Vincent Millay and Archibald MacLeish stand out particularly in his estimation. Fifty-two poets are included down to Kenneth Patchen, and the book closes with a very brief selection of Indian and Negro songs; the Indian songs

were translated from English versions that had probably retained very little of the true flavor of the original.

Bartra has been unusually successful in transposing his selections into Catalan verse. Always literally accurate, they often convey the very spirit and essence of their model, as in the perfect embodiment of *The Last Invocation*, where the slipping away of the soul is more fluid and poetic in Catalan than in English, and in the most beautiful evocation of any of the longer poems, *When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloomed*, delicately redolent of their perfume and borne on the liquid rise and fall of verse impregnated with subtly sensitive and poignant feeling. By omitting the long illustrative passages, Bartra has made a masterly synthesis of the *Song of Myself*, welded into a forceful presentation of Whitman's philosophy that retains the full sap and vigor of its unique original.

His translation of Sandburg's *Prairie*, too, is an amalgam of the most beautiful lines and essential ideas of that poem, resulting in a new and very fine picture of the prairie and its meaning. Indeed the very real impression he creates of Sandburg himself, his country, and his time is remarkable, considering that, during his ten years in the tropics, Bartra's own poetry was utterly untouched by his environment and remains purely and strictly Catalan.

While he sometimes fails to catch native strains in Whitman and others, and never succeeds in transposing into his own language the most profoundly indigenous aspect of Emily Dickinson's verse, in Frost, on the other hand, he chooses only typically regional scenes, which are reproduced with genuine success, as is also the unique beauty of the New England spring in Amy Lowell's *Lilacs*. Equally true is his treatment of vital bits of Masters, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Vachel Lindsay, and even occasionally Jeffers. He often catches the full lilt of Edna St. Vincent Millay and the rhythm of Elinor Wylie, as in his rendering of *Velvet Shoes*.

Ten years after the idea of translating American poems first occurred to him at Agde in France, Bartra received a Guggenheim Fellowship, which made it possible for him to complete his anthology on Whitman's Long Island in the spring of 1950.

JOSEPHINE DE BOER

Berkley, California

NIHON BUNGEI TO SEKAI BUNGEI (Japanese Literature and World Literature).
By Okazaki Yoshie. Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1950. 203 p.

The modern self-consciousness of the Japanese is reflected in their literary scholarship. Provincial to both Chinese and Western culture, they long to be cosmopolitan, if not independent. They are anxious to find a place in world literature—but where shall it be? No adequate theory has appeared, nor has Professor Okazaki, a leading theorist, advanced one. In this book, however, he criticizes an extreme "internationalist" opinion and offers his own sensible spec-

Okazaki begins, after a brief historical introduction, by discussing the study of influences. This is the field cultivated by most Japanese comparatists, after the French school; and Okazaki points out their emphasis on externals. They are using the method merely to calculate an enormous foreign debt; for Japan has exported little. *Genji* and a few lesser works have found translators; the *haiku* has had its vogue, especially in France; the *no*, its trace of influence. His conclusion is that the West has glanced at the surface of Japanese literature, at its ululations on the problem.

pleasant impressionism, but has not penetrated its symbolic depths. Literary appreciation remains at the level of *japonaiserie*, like an acquaintance with *ukiyo*e prints and *netsuke* in ignorance of the finest painting and sculpture.

But how to overcome the difficulties of translation? How, for example, to introduce an elaborate natural symbolism grounded in a radically different world view? These are questions not raised by Okazaki, who must first meet an attack from within. As there were Tokugawa Confucianists who wished to force all literature into the Chinese mold, so there are now those who doubt the value of the whole Sino-Japanese tradition.

The next section, accordingly, refutes the idea that Japanese literary men should adopt a humanist philosophy and, in their writing, seek an appropriate "universality." Okazaki considers Doi Kōchi, the chief exponent of this view, a premature and misguided world citizen; his analysis of Tokugawa literature, which he grossly underestimates, derives from a generic evolution theory based on superficial Western analogies; his dismissal of Japanese aesthetic concepts as indefinable is itself a mystification (Okazaki has published a series of works defining them); his program of shearing off national characteristics would not so much groom Japan for world literature as spoil its chance of contributing to it. Okazaki feels that traditional Oriental values have survived the Meiji technical revolution, and that they still have much to give to world culture. But he remarks that he has never joined the literary chauvinists, currently out of fashion; he hopes for mutual enrichment, rather than isolated purity or a colorless internationalism.

In the last section he sketches a method of studying the vast Japanese literary heritage. A chapter on literary history outlines (this his earlier works presented in detail) a proposal that it should be centered on literature as an art, specifically on the historical development of its forms and genres. Another chapter deals with established "periods," which he finds modeled after historical divisions inadequate even for their own purpose. Comparisons with the West have led to a number of dubious parallels; the Japanese "epic," for example, has been discovered only by those who define the genre loosely. Even the ordinary distinctions between ancient, mediaeval, and modern are false; Japan has no ancient literature (China supplied this lack); there was brilliant promise of a modern literature in the seventeenth century, but this was frustrated by the long period of national isolation, and fulfilled only after the nineteenth-century impact of the West. Okazaki sees in the protracted mediaeval culture a correlation with the emotional, rather than intellectual, tendency of Japanese literature, and with the long predominance of the lyric element in it. This lyric quality, characteristic of fiction and the drama as well as of poetry, has persisted tenaciously. It is one of the reasons why Japan should have a distinctive role in world literature. The metaphor which he uses for that role—"a flute in the symphony"—suggests the admirable modesty and balance of his views.

HOWARD HIBBETT

University of California, Los Angeles

DIDEROT'S RELATIONS WITH GRIMM. By Joseph Royall Smiley. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950. 127 p.

Although Friedrich Melchior Grimm's role as interpreter of the City of Light to the courts of eighteenth-century Europe has been the subject of a considerable

number of monographs and articles, the record of his works and days in France is still far from complete. With each new sifting of evidence, it has become increasingly clear that Grimm was not merely an interpreter and secretary of the French Enlightenment but a light bearer in his own right as well. Supplementing the work of André Cazes, Professor Smiley has provided further evidence of Grimm's contribution to the philosophic movement with his study of the influence of Grimm on Diderot.

Beginning with the background of the personal relations of the two men, Smiley proceeds to an analysis of their theories of drama and painting, showing the frequent promptings Diderot received from Grimm. By most contemporary accounts, Grimm's character had little in common with that of his devoted friend. While the warm and eloquent Diderot was an open book to any who were within reading distance, Grimm, we are told, was cold, dry, and uncommunicative. The personal *empire* which he exercised over his friends was observed by Rousseau and admitted by Diderot himself, who excused it with philosophic charity as nothing more than a manifestation of the natural and human imperialism of the will. For his own part Diderot had accepted it voluntarily, for he recognized Grimm to be as superior to himself as he thought he was superior to certain other men. He freely conceded that Grimm was wiser and more prudent than he, and there was apparently some vacillation in Diderot's mind as to whether the proper symbol for Grimm's position in their relationship was that of the hermaphrodite or the father. Grimm combined masculine force with feminine grace and delicacy, but he also treated Diderot sometimes like an inexperienced if precocious child and sometimes like a valet. Diderot accepted the burden of furnishing copy for Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire* during the latter's absences from Paris, and estimated that he had devoted more months to Grimm than Grimm had devoted quarter hours to him. But when Grimm reproached him for the tardiness of his copy, Diderot only took greater pains to redeem himself, and apparently felt amply rewarded by Grimm's ultimate words of praise. He admired Grimm's ability to please everybody, and he was undoubtedly impressed by the social success of a philosopher turned statesman and courtier, who had the ear and confidence of sovereigns.

The mystery of this friendship between two men of such apparently different temperament has puzzled critics from the time of Sainte-Beuve. Smiley, in general, follows Schérer and Cazes, who felt that the key to the enigma was that each found in the other the qualities which he himself lacked. This explanation is at least more meaningful than Sainte-Beuve's striking phrase that Grimm was the most French of Germans and Diderot the most German of Frenchmen, but it still rests firmly on the half-truth that opposites attract. While the fact of friendship undoubtedly eludes explanation by aphorism, a plausible case could be made out for the assumption that their mutual admiration and affection sprang rather from the things they had in common than from their differences. The contrast between the genial Diderot and the methodical Grimm has been exaggerated; Smiley's insistence that Grimm was the cuckoo and Diderot the nightingale of the abbé Galiani's tale concerning method versus genius is at least a partial reversal of roles. Grimm was the nightingale, not the cuckoo. (See Diderot's *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, ed. Babelon, I, 151-153.)

Smiley's second chapter retraces Diderot's and Grimm's theories of dramatic and operatic art, showing that it was at Grimm's instigation that Diderot wrote *Le Fils naturel* and *Le Père de famille*. The ideas of the *Entretiens sur Le Fils naturel*, Smiley points out, appeared first in Grimm's *Correspondance*, but, in view of the close personal association of the two men, this fact in itself is scarcely proof

that it was Grimm rather than Diderot who first formulated them. In his examination of the third *Entretien*, Professor Smiley has discovered that it contains some of the same themes that Diderot subsequently reworked in the *Neveu de Rameau*. He notes that both Grimm and Diderot cited Terence as a precedent for the new *genre sérieux*, but again he finds it impossible to determine whether it was Grimm or Diderot who thought of it first. This same similarity of principles which marked their dramatic theory marked their theory and criticism of painting and the plastic arts as well. Diderot modestly gave Grimm complete credit for whatever *notions réfléchies* he held on painting and sculpture, and it was Diderot's offer to review the art exhibit of 1759 for Grimm's *Correspondance* that was responsible for the remarkable work of art criticism known as the *Salons*. Here again, however, there is no conclusive evidence that Grimm influenced Diderot or that Diderot influenced Grimm.

It has taken a long time for Grimm to receive a full hearing from posterity and to be judged in the historical context of the French philosophic movement of which he was a part. Revolutionary France was not unnaturally suspicious of this foreigner within the gates whose activities as a personal agent for Catherine the Great were well known to its police. And if Grimm had the misfortune of outliving his illustrious contemporaries who were friends, his reputation has suffered the more from the fact that it was largely fixed for posterity by his bitterest enemy, whose *Confessions* have been read when Grimm's *Correspondance* has not. Despite Sainte-Beuve's attempt to rehabilitate Grimm as a great critic, subsequent studies have been less magnanimous. After Tourneux' publication of the Grimm texts, literary historians became more and more impressed by Grimm's apparent lack of appreciation for the French culture he was interpreting. As Edmond Schérer noted, he disliked French music and much French painting. He had grave reservations about the excellence of French classical tragedy. He believed that in important domains French scholarship and education had become superficial and hollow. He detested method, he had no great respect for French style, and he disliked the French language. Faced with this evidence Schérer concluded that Grimm simply disliked France. Louis Reynaud added that Grimm had been a German propagandist. Even Cazes, whose work on Grimm is the most recent, saw him as an opportunist and a *philosophe d'occasion* who used the French philosophers only for what they could contribute to his own fame and fortune. Morley before Cazes had attributed to him "the keen eye of his countrymen for his own interests" and concluded that the best thing that could be said in his favor was that he had won the friendship of Diderot.

On Professor Smiley's showing, this best was rather more considerable and more important than earlier critics of Grimm's character and national origins have generally allowed. As a study of influence, Smiley's essay is remarkable for the modesty of its conclusions and irreproachable for its method. On the principal subjects under investigation, namely the drama and art criticism, he has concluded that, while there is an unmistakable meeting of minds and while certain of Diderot's fundamental conceptions of art were first enunciated in Grimm's *Correspondance*, there is still no definitive proof that Grimm originated and Diderot copied. Although it would have been interesting to know whether their intellectual affinities extended to other aspects of philosophy as well, Grimm's greatest influence on Diderot in any case, Professor Smiley makes clear, was the encouragement which he imparted as Diderot's best friend. If this encouragement sometimes appeared as petty tyranny motivated by self-interest, it was still, as Smiley suggests, an indirect contribution to French literature.

It is regrettable that so careful a study should have been printed so carelessly, containing as it does over fifty typographical errors.

LELAND JAMES THIELEMAN

University of California, Los Angeles

BREVE HISTORIA DEL HISPANISMO INGLÉS. By Antonio Pastor. Madrid, 1948. 45 p. (Originally published in *Arbor*, Nos. 28-29, April-May, 1948.)

BRITISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO SPANISH AND SPANISH-AMERICAN STUDIES. By J. C. J. Metford. London: Published for the British Council by Longmans, Green and Co., 1950. 86 p.

These surveys of British interest in things Spanish contain valuable information and general ideas and suggestions that transcend the expectations announced by the titles. Professor Pastor's sketch is written with intelligent penetration. His understanding comments on Britishers and his Spanish humor make the reading of his pamphlet delightful. Unfortunately, he deals only with research on Spanish subjects. J. C. J. Metford's study complements Pastor's with an outline of research in the field of Spanish American culture and with recent publications dealing with Spain.

Antonio Pastor's *Breve historia del hispanismo inglés* is full of thought-provoking remarks on British Hispanists, who, according to the author, "representan una actitud humanista aguda y tolerante, y, más que de hispanismo británico, se trata de *humanismo hispanizante*, comparable al *humanismo italianizante inglés* de los siglos XVII y XVIII y *germanizante del pasado*" (p. 8). A most valuable suggestion is found in the conclusion: "es lícita la conclusión que de las dos grandes tendencias, la cervántica y la calderoniana, que operan sobre el *humanismo hispanizante inglés*, la que en estos tiempos tiene mayor actualidad, coincidiendo con profundas y generales preocupaciones religiosas y estéticas, es la segunda. Vuelve a escucharse la voz de la Contrarreforma y después de siglos de incomprensión resurgen fórmulas de origen españolísimo" (p. 44). Undoubtedly, this germ idea deserves a complete investigation. If Calderón and the formulas of the Counter-Reformation are gaining ground in England, some patient scholar should undertake the task of explaining this interest.

Pastor's general remarks and suggestions are the result of an unusually profound and extensive knowledge of both British and Spanish cultures and their interrelations. He has managed to write an accurate and solid history of British Hispanism without resorting to an arid cataloguing of publications, and at the same time has given us a glimpse of the adventurous lives of many Hispanists without falling into literary gossip. Since this pamphlet was originally an article, there is no index for quick reference.

J. C. J. Metford's *British Contributions to Spanish and Spanish-American Studies* opens with an enlightening discussion of the Black and Romantic legends of Spain, an account which is at the same time an excellent piece of popularization and a reaffirmation of faith in the values of the Spanish tradition. The survey of Hispanism in each period is preceded by a concise historical introduction, in which the author discusses the main events in the diplomatic and political relations between England and Spain. In the early sections of this book, Metford relies to some extent on Pastor's previous study, to which he adds valuable information, mostly in the field of Spanish art. He is no less skillful than Pastor in the graceful presentation of arid material.

The discussion of contributions to Spanish American studies is both encouraging and disappointing. It is hopeful to realize that many British scholars are working in the field, but most of them are historians and little interest is shown in the vigorous literature of Spanish America. Metford omits several items which, considering the broad scope of his study, should have been mentioned, and which indicate that some attention is paid to this literature. For example, F. A. Kirkpatrick, "Rubén Darío," in *The Year Book of Modern Languages* (Cambridge, 1920, pp. 158-165), is omitted, although Professor Kirkpatrick's historical studies are mentioned. Also worth noting is William F. Stirling's translation of Rodolfo Usigli's *Corona de sombra* (London, 1946). The index seems incomplete. St. John of the Cross is not listed, although the text (p. 55) mentions E. Allison Peers' work on the mystic poet.

A few titles omitted from both books are: William Coxe, *Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon . . . 1700-1788* (London, 1813), 3 vols., translated by Jacinto de Salas y Quiroga (Madrid, 1846-47), 4 vols.; James Kennedy, *Modern Poets and Poetry of Spain* (London, 1852); James York's translation of Count Lucanor; or, *The Fifty Pleasant Stories of Patronio* (Westminster, 1868); David Lewis, *Life of St. John of the Cross* (London, 1897) and *The Mystical Doctrine of St. John of the Cross* (London, 1946); Joseph Addison, *Charles the Third of Spain* (Oxford, 1900); J. G. Robertson, *Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1923); and the translations by Stephen Spender and J. L. Gili of García Lorca, *Poems* (London, 1938) and *Selected Poems* (London, 1943).

Comparatists will find in both studies numerous references to work already done and helpful suggestions for work yet to be done in the field of mutual English-Spanish influences. These may well be the point of departure for the definitive work on Spanish influence on English literature which Professor Pastor calls for: "Tenemos el conocido pero superado libro, de Martin Hume, *Spanish influence on English Literature*, Londres, 1905, que ya no puede servir de punto de partida para el investigador que se sienta con fuerzas y equipo para tan vasta y enciclopédica empresa" (p. 12).

BERNARDO GICOVATE

University of Oregon

CHINA UND DIE CHINESEN IN DER NEUEREN ENGLISCHEN UND AMERIKANISCHEN LITERATUR. By Peter Venne. Zürich: Juris-Verlag, 1951. 85 p.

This small book (a doctoral dissertation) is an attempt to summarize and—to a lesser degree—to evaluate the China motif in contemporary English and American literatures. The work begins with a review of Sino-European cultural contacts before the modern era, based on the usual authorities: Reichwein, Hudson, von Tscharnner, etc. This introduction, which takes up about one third of the book, includes a discussion of the treatment of the China theme in eighteenth-century Anglo-Saxon literature. The main thesis is developed in Chapter III, beginning with a kind of conducted tour through this literature, where most of the works which have appeared on the subject are noted and commented on briefly. Dr. Venne divides the authors into two classes: (1) those who have lived for a considerable time in China and can, therefore, speak with authority, and (2) those who have "cashed in" on their experiences in the country, as tourists or casual visitors. This catalogue of works should be valuable as a point of departure for others who wish to invade this field of study.

The valuable part of the book is contained in the second part of this chapter: "Das Chinabild in systematischer Schau." The author treats his material under three headings: (1) the country and people of precontemporary China, (2) China in her cultural relations with the West, and (3) China's national awakening in the war with Japan. An important place in this discussion is given to Pearl Buck (whom Dr. Venne rightfully puts at the head of the novelistic interpreters of China); but other writers, such as Nora Waln, Alice Tisdale Hobart, Dorothea Hosie, and Lin Yu Tang are not neglected. The drama is represented by only one play (O'Neill's *Marco's Millions*). In the field of poetry there is a short but interesting summary of Chinese influence on Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot and of the theory that the elements of concentration and suggestion, basic to Chinese verse, have vitally affected Anglo-Saxon poetry. It seems to the critic that the author does not find himself altogether at ease in discussing this phase of the subject. He neglects some important pioneers such as Witter Bynner (he mentions Arthur Waley in passing).

Dr. Venne finds in Pearl Buck and her compeers a wealth of sociological detail regarding many phases of Chinese life and regarding China's awakening and reaction to the dynamics and ideals of Western civilization. This mass of detail, taken *in toto*, gives a realistic picture of China's institutions, past and present: the historical xenophobia of the government, the struggle for life in a land which is eternally poor, the delicate balance between high fecundity and high mortality, the importance and nature of the family system, the position of women, the sociological results of China's partial Westernization, the dilemma of the "returned student," the emancipation of the Occidentalized female, the swinging of the pendulum between revolutionary thought and a return to the social solidarity of Confucianism, the renaissance of letters under the impetus of the new *pei hua* language and of foreign literary models, and, finally, the confusion of this interregnum of thought, with its disillusion with Western culture and its resulting pessimism. The author is impressed with the following aspects: (1) the variety of material presented, (2) its abundance, (3) the underlying spirit of realism, and (4) its assistance in destroying the old fetich of the incomprehensibility of the Chinese.

The last chapter presents a brief but illuminating discussion of the young Chinese novelistic interpreters of modern China. The material is taken chiefly from Henry van Boven's *Histoire de la littérature chinoise contemporaine* (Peking, 1946). Here is a field which is well worth the attention of students in comparative literature.

A book of such small size, on such an extensive subject, must of necessity be rather superficial; but the author has been competent and meticulous in his search for sources and has left little unnoticed. Dealing, as it does, with belletristic material only, the book does not attempt to take into account the large number of interpretative works of a scholarly or expository nature. Perhaps the main impression left with the reader is that we are today, in our treatment of China in literature, very far from that spirit of imaginative and vague exoticism which dominated similar literature in the eighteenth and even in the nineteenth century, and that we are approaching, even in creative writing, a more realistic and also a more sympathetic understanding of the problems and enigmas of this great Oriental civilization.

ARNOLD H. ROWBOTHAM

University of California, Berkeley

LIFE OF JULIUS CAESAR SCALIGER (1484-1558). By Vernon Hall, Jr. Philadelphia, 1950. (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N.S., vol. 40, part 2, pp. 83-170.)

Mr. Hall has given us a fascinating and painstakingly documented study of the life of the famous author of the *Poetics*; the only reproach we can address to this masterful work concerns the unexpectedly brief treatment of Scaliger's *magnum opus* (pp. 151-154). It can, of course, be argued that the *Poetics* has been sufficiently analyzed by men like Lintilhac and also in Mr. Hall's other publications, and that the main task of the present work was a careful reconstruction of Scaliger's life from the documents available in Europe and from the Scaliger family papers bequeathed to the American Philosophical Society; but even so the reader may wish that a slightly broader and deeper outline of the *Poetics* might have been given us, for it is and remains one of the most important books in neoclassical literary criticism.

This first full-length biography of Scaliger opens up many vistas into international literary relations. There is, e.g., the question whether the proud and passionate Scaliger really descended from the celebrated Della Scalas of Verona—a question which Mr. Hall does not answer decisively, though much corroborating documentation makes one inclined to accept as true the claims of this refugee expelled by the conquests of the Venetians. Then there is the question of Scaliger's relationship with the famous men of his century which Mr. Hall analyzes interestingly and in considerable detail: his quarrel with Rabelais over medical matters, his attacks upon Erasmus for having belittled the Ciceronians, his contempt for Etienne Dolet for stealing his arguments for his own attacks upon Erasmus, his hidden sympathies for certain aspects of Protestantism which brought him into a short conflict with the Inquisition, his spirited attack against Plato and other slanderers of poetry, his acquaintance with Nostradamus, his successful efforts to liberate Melanchthon's nephew who had been held a captive near Agen, his eulogy of the Germans who had defeated the Turks at Vienna (in contrast to his orations against Erasmus in which he denounces the latter's Germanic background as barbarian), his friendship for Bandello (like himself an Italian residing in southern France), his influence upon Muret, La Boétie, and others, his third great battle (after Rabelais and Erasmus) with the scientist Jerome Cardan, and so on. All these facts and events place Scaliger squarely in the middle of the great international commerce of ideas and literary trends which makes the Renaissance so fascinatingly cosmopolitan; without an awareness of them, the personality of Scaliger, his significance as a neo-Latin author and humanist, and his importance as a physician who was interested both in literature and in the sciences would not be fully understood. Like so many of his contemporaries, Scaliger was a *uomo universale* on an amazing scale: he was a soldier, doctor, philosopher, translator (e.g., of Aristotle), grammarian (*The Principles of the Latin Language*), physicist, botanist, poet (see, for instance, his poems for Costanza Ragona), as well as the father of neoclassical literary criticism.

All these points of interest to the student of literature are clearly brought out by Mr. Hall. What amazes the reader constantly is not only Scaliger's wide variety of interests and his indefatigable activity in all fields but also the joyous zest with which he welcomed acrimonious polemical battles which, he said, helped far more than meditation to sharpen his wit—battles which ranged from brutally vulgar personal attacks (for instance, on Erasmus' illegitimacy) to a readiness to forget and forgive. He was the father of Joseph Scaliger, whose education

at the College of Guyenne at Bordeaux he supervised with loving care, and who became a Protestant and a celebrated scholar in his own right.

W. P. F.

A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF FRENCH LITERATURE, edited by D. C. Cabeen. Vol. IV: *The Eighteenth Century*, edited by George R. Havens and Donald F. Bond. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1951. xxx, 411 p.

If the subsequent volumes keep up the high norm set by the two volumes which have appeared to date, the *Critical Bibliography of French Literature*, published under the general editorship of D. C. Cabeen, will become a standard work for decades to come. The first volume on mediaeval French literature, edited by U. T. Holmes, appeared in 1947; this has been so successful that a second improved and enlarged printing has already become necessary.

The present volume contains eleven long chapters and 3,319 items; the total number of different titles, however, is several score less, since there are many duplications and even triplications of titles. Since Messrs. Havens and Bond worked with a staff of forty-three specialists, their bibliography could be annotated, an advantage over works of a similar character which are compiled by only one or two men. Of particular significance are Chapters VI on Montesquieu by D. C. Cabeen, VII on Voltaire by G. R. Havens, VIII on Rousseau by P. M. Spurlin, IX on Diderot by H. Dieckmann and N. L. Torrey, and, for comparatists, XI on the foreign influences and relations of French literature. This important chapter (items 2885-3319) is subdivided into the following sections: English by D. F. Bond (by far the largest), American by J. F. McDermott, German by H. Remak, Italian by C. B. Beall, and Spanish by C. N. Staubach. Here the comparatist finds a very rich harvest. The system of annotations makes it possible to point to comparative chapters and pages in works whose titles would not, as such, have revealed the international character of the books or articles in question.

The presentation of most authors follows a logical pattern, beginning with the best editions of the works, occasional English or American translations, discussions of the entire man, then of individual phases or works, and finally discussions of his relationship with his French or foreign contemporaries. It is a selective bibliography, which means that it is far from complete, and yet the staff of specialists no doubt had sound reasons for the inclusion or the omission of this or that book. The annotations are uniformly concise, and the criticism is almost always fair and constructive. Among the minor and specific contributions, the lengthy section by Gabriel Bonno giving a chronological list of periodicals with accompanying studies (items 2804-2866) is particularly rich and well done. The exceedingly detailed and helpful index (pp. 369-411) deserves great praise.

In order to restrict the unruly material and preserve a proper balance between the various fields the editors have often cut down particularly promising sections (e.g., those on French relations with America, Italy, Spain, and Germany). Yet they have given what seems to be excessive space to eighteenth-century music, economy, and science, and to such minor figures as Maupertuis, Bonnet, Vauvenargues, Turgot, et al. Much space could also have been saved for other purposes if some of the double or triple discussions of the same work had been put together under one heading.

W. P. F.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Albérès, R. M. *L'Odyssée d'André Gide*. Paris: La Nouvelle Edition, 1951. 282 p.
- Bell, Clair Hayden. *The Meistersingerschule at Memmingen and its "Kurtze Entwurfung."* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952. 90 p.
- Bett, W. R. *The Infirmities of Genius*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 182 p.
- Bloomfield, Morton W. *The Seven Deadly Sins*. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1952. xiv, 482 p.
- Botteghe Oscure, Vol. X (1952). 480 p (32 Via Botteghe Oscure, Rome.)
- Börne, Louis. *Etudes sur l'histoire et les hommes de la Révolution Française*. Ed. Joseph Dresch. Lyon-Paris: IAC, 1952. 152 p.
- Brachin, Pierre. *Les Influences françaises dans l'œuvre de Stagnelius*. Lyon-Paris: IAC, 1952. 159 p.
- Briggs, Arthur E. *Walt Whitman: Thinker and Artist*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 472 p.
- Bush, Douglas. *Classical Influences in Renaissance Literature*. Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. XIII. Cambridge, Mass.: Published for Oberlin College by Harvard University Press, 1952. xii, 60 p.
- Campbell, Roy. *Light on a Dark Horse: An Autobiography (1901-1935)*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., xvi, 312 p.
- Cooper, Chas. W. *The Arts and Humanity: A Psychological Introduction to the Fine Arts*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. xvi, 334 p.
- Corneille. *The Chief Plays*. Translated into English blank verse with an introductory study of Corneille by Lacy Lockert. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. ix, 387 p.
- Cosentini, John W. *Fontenelle's Art of Dialogue*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1952. xi, 240 p.
- Crane, Ronald S., and others (editors). *English Literature 1660-1800. A Bibliography of Modern Studies Compiled for Philological Quarterly*. Vol. II, 1939-1950. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. 579-1292 p.
- Cueto y Mena, Juan de. *Obras*. Ed. Archer Woodford. Prólogo de José Manuel Rivas Sacconi. Bogotá, 1952. xxxix, 315 p. (Publicaciones del Instituto Caro y Cuervo, No. IX.)
- Delta: *Rivista di critica e di cultura*. Nuova serie, No. 1, June, 1952. (Viale Michelangelo 16, Naples.)
- Fogle, Richard Harter. *Hawthorne's Fiction: The Light and the Dark*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952. ix, 219 p.
- Fujimura, Thomas H. *The Restoration Comedy of Wit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. x, 232 p.
- Ibsen, Bergliot. *The Three Ibsens: Memories of Henrik Ibsen, Suzannah Ibsen and Sigurd Ibsen*. Translated from the Norwegian by Gerik Schjelderup. Foreword by Professor Francis Bull. New York: American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1952. viii, 184 p.
- Jacobi, Hansres. *Amphitryon in Frankreich und Deutschland*. Zürich: Juris-Verlag, 1952. 135 p.
- Kyrrö, Kauko. *Fenelons Ästhetik und Kritik*. Helsinki, 1951. 82 p. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B. Tom. 73, 2.)

- Lange, Victor (editor). *Great German Short Novels and Stories*. New York: Modern Library, 1952. xxi, 486 p.
- Levin, Harry. *The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. xiii, 204 p.
- Merkel, R. F. *Leibniz und China*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1952. 38 p.
- Montano, Rocco. *Arte, Realtà e Storia (L'estetica del Croce e il mondo dell' arte)*. Naples: Conte Editore, 1951. 200 p.
- Naiden, James R. *The Sphera of George Buchanan*. n.p., 1952. vii, 184 p.
- Pei, Mario A., and Frank Gaynor (editors). *Liberal Arts Dictionary in English French German Spanish*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. x, 307 p.
- Pfeffer, A. Alan (editor). *Essays on German Language and Literature in Honor of Theodore B. Hewitt*. Buffalo: University of Buffalo, 1952. (University of Buffalo Studies, Vol. XX, No. 1.)
- Praz, Mario. *La crisi dell'eroe nel romanzo vittoriano*. Florence: Sansoni, 1952. 457 p.
- Ray, Gordon N. *The Buried Life: A Study of the Relation between Thackeray's Fiction and his Personal History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. vi, 148 p.
- Riordan, Sister Francis Ellen. *The Concept of Love in the French Catholic Literary Revival (Literary History of a Motif)*. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1952. x, 206 p.
- Röhrman, H. *Marlowe and Shakespeare: A Thematic Exposition of Some of Their Plays*. Arnhem: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1952. 109 p.
- Ryder, Frank G. *George Ticknor's The Sorrows of Young Werter: Edited with Introduction and Critical Analysis*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1952. xxxiii, 108 p.
- Seznec, Jean. *On Two Definitions of Literature: An Inaugural Lecture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. 19 p.
- Staaks, Walter. *The Theater of Louis-Benoit Picard*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 28, No. 7. pp. 359-462.)
- Wadsworth, Philip A. *Young la Fontaine: A Study of his Artistic Growth in his Early Poetry and First Fables*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1952. x, 236 p.
- West, Ray B., Jr. (editor). *Essays in Modern Literary Criticism*. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1952. xi, 611 p.
- West, Ray B., Jr. *The Short Story in America, 1900-1950*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952. xii, 147 p.
- Williams, W. D. *Nietzsche and the French*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952. xxi, 206 p.
- Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature*. Edited by W. P. Friederich and Horst Frenz. Chapel Hill, 1952. viii, 144 p.
- Zeydel, Edwin H., and Bayard Quincy Morgan (editors). *Poems of Walther von der Vogelweide. Thirty New English Renderings in the Original Forms with the Middle High German Texts, Selected Modern German Translations*. Ithaca: Thrift Press, 1952. 78 p.
- Zhigalova, Olga. *Across the Green Past*. Translated by Tatiana Balkoff Drowne. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952. vii, 214 p.
- Znaniecki, Florian. *Modern Nationalities: A Sociological Study*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952. xvi, 196 p.





